## DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 061 907 HE 003 004

| | |
|---|---|
| TITLE | Teaching the Large Class at the Undergraduate Level. Final Report. |
| INSTITUTION | Lane Community Coll., Eugene, Oreg. |
| PUB DATE | Feb 72 |
| NOTE | 128p. |
| EDRS PRICE | MF-$0.65 HC-$6.58 |
| DESCRIPTORS | *Educational Coordination; *Higher Education; *Large Group Instruction; *Lecture; *Undergraduate Study |

ABSTRACT

In the summer of 1970, a study was undertaken at Lane Community College, Eugene, Oregon, in an attempt to explore the effectiveness of certain organizational patterns in teaching a large class at the undergraduate level. This document presents the final report of the study, which is organized as follows: Chapter 1 presents a review of related research and a summary of the implications of that research as it pertains to the project. After a statement of objectives and assumptions, Chapter 2 offers a description of the class organization and the actual operation of the large class lecture sessions, the small class discussion groups, and the leader seminars. Various administrative considerations and the project evaluations by the instructional staff are also included in this chapter. Chapter 3 provides an independent evaluation of the large class project, including an account of the sources of data, a description of the questionnaire instrument and its use, and analysis of the findings in light of project objectives. (Author/HS)

ED 061 907

# TEACHING THE LARGE CLASS AT THE UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 003 004

Eugene, Oregon • February, 1972

FINAL REPORT

PROJECT 2-131

# TEACHING THE LARGE CLASS AT THE UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL

Peter K. Simpson
Project Director

Gregory P. Maltby
Principal Investigator

Eugene, Oregon
February, 1972

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

Foreword: Background of Project and Organization of Report

CHAPTER I REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE PROJECT . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 1

CHAPTER II CLASS ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION . . . . . . . . . . . 6

Introduction . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 6
The Large Class--Lecture Sessions . . . . . . . . . . . 7
  Instructional Objectives
  Study Guides
  Lectures
  Friday Sessions
  Special Supporting Facilities and Materials
The Small Class--Peer Discussion Group . . . . . . . 20
  Discussion Leaders and Seminars
  Enrollment and Attendance
  Projects
  Evaluation: Discussion Leaders
Administrative Considerations . . . . . . . . . . . . . 33
Instructor Evaluation . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 35
  Instructor Efficiency
  Instructor Effectiveness
  Special Evaluation: Course Content and Instructional Objectives
Conclusions . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 42

CHAPTER III AN INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF THE LARGE CLASS PROJECT . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 46

Sources of Data in Light of Project Objectives . . . . 46
  The Questionnaires Described
  General Profile of Respondents
Findings . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 52
  Student Morale: Attendance, Attitude, and Turnover Rate
  Perceived Effectiveness of Instructor and Discussion Leaders
  Student Evaluation of Resources and Format of Course

CHAPTER IV CONCLUSION AND POSTSCRIPT . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 72

Appendix

A Grant Proposal
B Course Content Questionnaire
C Evaluation Questionnaires (four)

# FINAL REPORT ON PROJECT 2-131

## PROPOSAL: Teaching the Large Class at the Undergraduate Level

## FOREWORD

In the summer of 1970, a study (Project 2-131) was undertaken at the Lane Community College, Eugene, Oregon, under auspices of the Educational Coordinating Council, in an attempt to explore the effectiveness of certain organizational patterns in teaching a large class at the undergraduate level. The course in which the study was pursued was in United States history, taught by Peter K. Simpson assisted by Nancy Smith and Robert Ashton, two teaching assistants, and 13 student leaders. The project was conducted during a full-year, three-term course, granting three credit hours per term.

This final report of Project 2-131 is organized as follows: CHAPTER I presents a review of related research and a summary of the implications of that research as it pertains to the project. After a statement of objectives and assumptions, CHAPTER II deals with a description of the class organization and actual operation--the large class lecture sessions, the small class discussion groups, the leader seminars, administrative considerations, and the project evaluations by the instructional staff.

CHAPTER III provides an independent evaluation of the large class project, including an account of the sources of data, a description of the questionnaire instrument and its use, and an analysis of the findings in light of project objectives.

This chapter is followed by a CONCLUSION and Postscript and by the Appendix, which supplies the grant proposal objectives, and copies of the questionnaires themselves.

# CHAPTER I

## A REVIEW OF RELATED RESEARCH AND ITS IMPLICATIONS FOR THE PROJECT

There are many myths that develop in any institution and formal education has not been denied its share. Class size as it relates to the teaching-learning environment is most certainly the most formidable of these myths. In addition and closely related, there is a whole domain of assumptions made about various teaching techniques.

These myths and assumptions continue in spite of many years of investigation and a large number of studies to the contrary. It is the intent of this chapter to examine briefly two general sources that summarize the empirical research on class size, teaching techniques, and learning especially as they may pertain to the college level.

In a monograph entitled The Teaching-Learning Paradox, Robert Dubin and Thomas Taveggia review and re-analyze ca. forty years of research dealing with methods of instruction at the college level.[1] Their conclusions are unequivocal:

> The evidence is all in upon which we may base our conclusions about the relative utility of given methods of college teaching, when this utility is measured through final examinations: There are no differences that amount to anything.[2]

---

[1] Robert Dubin and Thomas C. Taveggia, The Teaching-Learning Paradox: A Comparative Analysis of College Teaching Methods (Eugene, Oregon: Center for the Advanced Study of Educational Administration, University of Oregon, 1968).

[2] Ibid., p. 8.

To amplify further, they examined independent study vs. "face-to-face instructional procedures" research and found that college students passed ". . . their course examinations with equal facility and level of performance."[3] This result was also found to be the case in all other comparisons of various "face-to-face instructional procedures."

In their lead chapter, "The Issues Posed," Dubin and Taveggia suggest that there are at least three factors that characterize the teaching-learning situation at the college level:

> . . . (1) voluntarism on the part of the student in choosing the subjects of instruction; (2) a knowledge base possessed by the student for making judgments about the content and quality of instruction received, judgments which, in turn, influenced the voluntary choices made; and (3) the complex of culturally derived expectations and behaviors which comprise what we loosely summarize as the motivation to learn.[4]

These points are raised to suggest elements in the teaching-learning situation that might be fruitful to take into account when doing research at the college level of instruction. In addition, on the basis of their examination of self-study, the authors raise the question of the role of printed material in learning. "The book rather than the instructor becomes the teacher."[5] When discussing policy decisions either by teachers or administrators related to teaching techniques (class size then becoming an important element), Dubin and Taveggia suggest that it is not research but ideology which settles matters about what methods a teacher uses or the size of class teachers will have at the college level. For example, if there appears to be no difference in methodology of teaching-learning, the advocates of very small seminars as well as those who advocate large lecture groups can equally assert that their preference is not disproven by research to be less productive in student learning.[6] Thereby, advocates of a particular method, whether instructors or administrators, may continue to argue for one format of instruction over another. This is evident when classrooms are constructed which restrict variation of class size to any substantial degree, or when for reasons of economy, universities employ at the lower undergraduate level very large lecture sections to the exclusion of any other instructional method. Policy decisions on matters of this kind cannot be supported or denied on the basis of the present state of research.[7]

---

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 33.

[4] *Ibid.*, p. 7.

[5] Ibid., p. 2. The suggestion also comes through in this source and others--some based on research, others not--that a student's peers may also be a student's "teachers" under various formal and informal situations.

William Vincent did an extensive review of the research dealing with the relation of class size to learning.[8] At all levels of schooling, the evidence appears to be mixed and inconclusive. Reviewing the studies related to college-level class size, Vincent, with only one exception, found no significant statistical differences in student achievement measured either by tests or class marks when class size was varied along with the technique of instruction (e.g., large classes-lecture, small classes-discussion).

---

[6] Ibid., p. 9.

[7] Ibid.

[8] William S. Vincent, "Class Size," in Encyclopedia of Educational Research, ed. by Robert L. Ebel (4th ed. London: The Macmillan Co., 1969), pp. 141-146.

The author by implication suggests that class-size policy is established on the basis of factors other than empirical research at all levels of schooling. These factors may be labeled external (i.e., the community paying the cost of low student-teacher ratio) and internal (school facilities and physical space determining class size).

Given the above considerations, the originators of the project at Lane Community College made certain assumptions and course plans based on research findings as well as on their own experience:

> Set up a project to include a variety of teaching methods (lecture, discussion, project, etc.) The variety itself may offer something for everyone, but will economize the major instructor's time in certain functions (major lectures) so that he can increase his time for other functions (increased office hours for one-to-one contact).
>
> Include in the project a carefully selected but limited number (at any one time) of printed materials (books, course outlines, etc.).
>
> Add to the "instructional force" carefully selected students as small group discussion leaders.
>
> Maintain a position that voluntary class attendance (not a universal practice at Lane) is clearly acceptable. Roll will not be taken.

If there is little evidence one way or another that students learn better by one teaching technique or another, or that class size is important, or that attending class on a regular basis affects student performance, why not provide a teaching situation with a high degree of flexibility that economizes teacher time in the formal classroom setting? The basic assumption, given the above, was that student performance should not suffer.

This assumption could be monitored, in part, by asking students their perceptions of the project in its various aspects as the year went on.

It also seemed reasonable in light of the vast array of "tightly designed" statistical studies on class size and teaching methods which collectively show little significance, that the evaluation of the project might well be far less rigidly structured in the traditional sense. The evaluation would to a large extent depend on what the students who participate in the project have to say about it. They would be the ones most directly affected (or unaffected) by being in the project.

The use of students' grade profiles from the project, matched to previous grade profiles given by the same instructor in prior years, was assumed to be an adequate if crude additional measure for project evaluation. In addition, keeping gross attendance records (number of people attending) might give some indication of student interest in light of the voluntary nature of class attendance. It would appear from the evidence examined that regular attendance is essentially unrelated to student performance.

On these ideas the project was developed. Its description in detail will come next.

# CHAPTER II

# CLASS ORGANIZATION AND OPERATION

## Introduction

This portion of the report deals with the development of the course throughout the year. It is an account of what went on in the class and what was done on a continuing basis to help achieve the goals outlined in the grant proposal under objectives A through D.[1] The approach will be a historical one, but the organization will be topical in order to better accomplish the following: 1) explain the development of instructional techniques and methods in the large class, the discussion leader seminars, and the discussion groups; 2) show the interrelationships and the functions of these techniques and methods in the large class, leader seminars, and discussion groups; and 3) include the instructor's evaluation of these techniques and methods in terms of his own efficiency and effectiveness.

The overall structure of the course took its form from the two basic assumptions that 1) student morale and performance could be maintained through student-led, small-class participation at the same time that 2) teacher efficiency and effectiveness could be improved through large-class scheduling and presentation. Thus, the body of the report will follow the course structure, dealing first with the large class, second with the small class, third with administrative considerations, and fourth with instructor evaluations.

---

[1] See Grant Proposal, Appendix A, pp. 4-12.

## The Large Class--Lecture Session

Mondays and Fridays of each week were given over to full 50-minute class meetings in a large auditorium equipped with a wide variety of audio-visual facilities and instructional aids, and with potential seating for 500 students. This gave flexibility in the classroom environment. It also afforded an opportunity to use a variety of teaching techniques--"Smorgasbord," as this arrangement came to be called among staff members and students alike.

Standard syllabi incorporating these plans and describing the course were handed out to the students at the beginning of each term's work. Instructional objectives, couched in procedural and descriptive material, were clarified by statements made in class by the instructor as the term progressed. Eventually, these objectives were included in weekly study guides given the students throughout each of the three terms.

### Instructional Objectives

Some of the most important goals of the course were those most difficult to measure. Though there are no real data either to confirm or deny achievement of these goals, they gave shape and purpose to all other measurable objectives of the course. There were two main goals. The first goal was to impart a sense of America's cultural distinctiveness through a process of continually identifying, or having the students identify, developing habits and traditions which contrasted with developing habits and traditions in other cultures, emphasizing, where possible, the component forces of what is called "the American Way of Life" (e.g., the unique frontier experience, the pursuit of material ends, or the relative classlessness of American society) and making comparisons with certain other cultures. The second goal was to help students develop a keener sense of "self" by encouraging them to look for the sources of values, beliefs, prejudices, and attitudes which corresponded to their own values, beliefs, prejudices, and attitudes--i.e., to look for clues in the past which would help them to better identify themselves within the greater identity of the American nation-state which encompasses them (e.g., the Puritan doctrine of the "calling" and hard work, the other side of racial pride which is racial intolerance, the on-going American sense of mission, or the belief in progress). Both of these objectives were communicated to students throughout the year at appropriate junctures where the course material afforded good examples of the kinds of facts and ideas which relate to "the self."[2]

Concrete instructional objectives were directly related to content learning and only secondarily to attainment of the project objectives of morale, effectiveness, and efficiency. They are reviewed here simply because the methods used to teach the course and achieve project objectives stemmed directly from instructional objectives. The several concrete objectives students were to try to achieve were: 1) to demonstrate on examinations a knowledge of cause and effect relationships (historical process), and multi-causal relationships (historical complexity) leading to such events as the English colonization of

---

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 6.

America, the formation of the Constitution of the United States, the Civil War, the period of Progressive Reform, etc.; 2) to show on examinations some mastery of historical concepts such as mercantilism, political liberalism or conservatism, Jacksonian democracy, industrialism, nationalism, sectionalism, etc.; 3) to be able to recognize and describe on examinations and in a questionnaire at the end of the course the nature of certain basic themes in American history such as war, revolution, idealism, imperialism, the struggle between liberty and order, the development of the American conscience and the on-going power of the American dream, etc., and to be able to recognize the relationship between the historical periods which they had studied and these major themes to which they had been exposed;[3] 4) to be able to demonstrate on examinations through appropriate questions the relevance of the above cause-and-effect relationships, concepts, and themes to an understanding of America today; 5) to be able to show on examinations, in small discussion groups, and in class some recognition of what it means to read carefully and critically, by reading selected essays and answering oral and written questions about them; 6) to be able to use the tools of a historian, including the interview, the use of original source materials, the application of the "rules of evidence," and the development of techniques of organization and presentation, in a group project in which they were to help choose a topic, research it, and present it to the class in coherent form.

---

[3] Ibid., p. 34-36.

## Study Guides

The functions of the weekly study guides were developed as the course progressed; these developments stemmed from discussion leader and student feedback and from formal questionnaires administered during the year. When it became clear that the course term syllabi were not sufficiently directed toward course objectives, the study guide format was changed to include course objectives in the following manner: 1) by distilling and editing textbook and lecture materials and organizing them into important objective-related topics followed by thought-provoking questions; 2) by serving as vehicles for announcing well in advance the topics for weekly lectures and discussion groups; 3) by including a very few selected optional readings; and 4) by emphasizing names of a few people or events which were deemed important. This change made the study guides more valuable than the syllabi in the students' minds; by winter term the study guides were essentially weekly syllabi.

Special study guides were used to help students with assigned supplemental reading. These guides, designed to help clarify the course objectives, were also related to the development of careful and critical reading habits. They were handed out for each essay or book assigned and were used as the basis for discussions in both the large class and the small discussion groups. Questions were incorporated on tests to elicit information about the content of the reading and about the student's critical evaluation of the reading from the standpoint of author bias, the climate of "opinion" in which it was written, and other criteria of judgment. The performance level on these test questions was generally satisfactory.[4]

Lectures

Monday classes were devoted to lectures which were designed 1) to pose questions and major themes, ideas, and concepts related to each week's work, and 2) to expose students to a historian's way of thinking.[5] It was not a function of the lectures to repeat or rehash textbook material for its own sake. Students who had difficulty with textbook reading were encouraged to discuss these problems with the instructor during any of his 20 available office hours, or consult with the teaching assistants during any of their five office hours per week. Since sufficient time was provided to accommodate the students, many took advantage of this opportunity for consultation.

The lecture format incorporated a good deal of variety on the assumption that variety could improve morale if a proper balance were achieved between inductive and deductive methods, the use of audio-visual aids and attention-getting devices, the combining of informal, loosely structured approaches and more formal, tightly structured approaches. This emphasis on variety came from implications arising out of Lewis Goldberg's studies on the relationship between teaching methods and student performance and from information obtained from

---

[4] The one time we did not hold a class discussion of an assigned book in the large class, was also the one time we failed to get a good performance on the test. It must be inferred that the study guides alone, apart from class discussion, were not of sufficient help to students. (All study guides referred to in this segment as well as syllabi for each term's work are in the files of the principal investigator.)

[5] The latter refers to the "emulative model" of the teacher which Jerome Bruner discusses in his book, Jerome Bruner, Toward a Theory of Instruction, pp. 124-125.

Dubin and Taveggia's *The Teaching-Learning Paradox.*[6] Both studies revealed that there were no measurable correlations between teaching methods and student performance as measured by tests and that the impact of different teaching methods was distinguished only in affective responses such as improved morale. The clear implication was that the use of continually changing methods might be even better classroom morale and would still have no adverse effect on performance.

A few general conclusions were drawn from evaluation questionnaires asking for student responses to these methods.[7] For one thing, since tests were inevitably linked to lectures, an overlong period of informal, loosely structured lectures adversely affected student morale. Secondly, dialogue in the large class, though an effective way to get the class intellectually "involved," ended by including only a very few participants. Since the use of dialogue on a continuing basis brought diminishing returns in student morale, it was used less and less as the year progressed. Thirdly, informal lectures could be used more often if diagrams, outlines, or maps were used. Students preferred a friendly, informal atmosphere as long as clarity and structure were preserved. In all of this the main point seemed to be that variety was considered beneficial; the "cut and dried" lecture approach was not considered desirable.

Whether "cut and dried" or informal, all lectures required planning. One note of caution must be entered at this point. So much of the success of the project seemed to depend upon the discussion groups that instructor time was inadvertently channeled into discussion leader training far more than into lecture session planning, largely because of the instructor's mistake in not recognizing earlier that the success of the lectures and the success of the discussions were interdependent. Anyone wishing to follow a similar format must be aware of a very real tendency, particularly during the first term, to overemphasize the discussion aspect of the course to the detriment of lectures and other equally important matters.

---

[6] Grant Proposal p. 3 and Robert Dubin and Thomas C. Taveggia, *The Teaching-Learning Paradox: A Comparative Analysis of College Teaching Methods*, pp. 11-23.

[7] See Appendix C. Evaluation Questionnaire, number 2, particularly questions 5 and 9.

An additional comment might be made concerning lecture effectiveness. During fall term it was discovered that a single theme like revolution or war lent itself to a "unit" approach whenever it came into major focus in such incidents as the American Revolution or the Civil War. The "unit" approach simply meant that more than one week could be spent on one theme, and the theme itself could be dealt with from several different points of view (e.g., that of interpretive history or that of single causation or that of the political scientist or the scientist of revolution). Because of positive student response to the two-week unit on the American Revolution, a five-week unit was constructed around the Civil War, with guest lectures as well as movies and panels to add to the variety. The staff and the discussion leader evaluations judged this unit to be the most successful single large class endeavor of the year--successful in that it gave an opportunity to focus on nearly all the course objectives through one major topic, e.g., causal relationships, concepts, themes, and contemporary relevance. The unit approach undoubtedly recommends itself to other themes, but in the attempt to apply it, it was found that few topics were as susceptible to this approach as was the Civil War--possibly because not all topics were as emotionally charged as this one.

## Friday Sessions

In the grant proposal the original object of the Friday session was to provide instructor-led advanced study sessions and study skills sessions on alternate weeks.[8] This objective was not implemented for two reasons. One was that Lane Community College already had a well-developed study skills program with up-to-date equipment and a highly qualified staff. Secondly, after consulting among staff members and reviewing questionnaires taken for a similarly structured class at the University of Oregon, it was concluded that the plan might seem discriminatory--dividing the class into what U of O students called "eggheads" and "dunces," to the detriment of overall morale.

Thus, Friday sessions were constructed to provide yet another source of instructional variety. However, it took time to achieve this purpose. During the first term, the Friday session came to be a sort of "catch-all" hour in which tests were given and handed back, evaluations taken, administrative procedures announced, questions answered, panels held, films shown, guest lectures given, and informal talk sessions conducted--all depending on what had or had not been accomplished in the two sessions earlier in the week. Plainly, the Friday session had come to be a "make weight" for unanticipated deficiencies in the other two sessions, particularly the discussion sessions.

---

[8] Grant Proposal, pp. 5-6.

But the second student questionnaire of fall term indicated that most students felt the Friday sessions were not worth their time--that they were too spontaneous and unpredictable. The comments did not suggest less variety, only more careful planning.[9]

During the second term, the first ten minutes of the Friday session was used for announcements and the rest of the time either for films, guest lectures (which were popular), panels, tests, or the evaluations that were scheduled. The informal talk sessions and question-and-answer periods were eliminated. Student response favored these changes. Thus, it became clear that for Friday as well as for Monday a variety of methods could be effective if the sessions themselves were well planned and structured. What students clearly approved of in the large class setting was content structure, informality, and variety.[10]

## Special Supporting Facilities and Materials

Audio-Visual Aids. In the interests of both structure and variety, audio-visual aids were used each term but with somewhat uneven results. Movie films were the biggest problem. Good historical films were expensive, and copyright laws prevented reproducing some excellent television films. Consequently, films were mostly limited to those from the Lane County Intermediate Education District film library, and unfortunately, these were not of very high quality. Also, several of the students who lived in the Eugene-Springfield area had already seen these films.

---

[9] Appendix C, Evaluation questionnaire, number 2, questions 1 and 2.

[10] Chapter III, pp. 59, 61, 65-67.

Such problems were complicated by some administrative mix-ups with the Audio-Visual Aids center on campus. Consequently, only one film was shown winter term--and that was a 20-minute student-made film taken with modern documentary techniques from old photographs and paintings and set to a recording of Stephen Vincent Benet's epic poem, John Brown's Body. The quality, impact, and effectiveness of this student film far exceeded that of the others previously used. What is more, this film and a film made spring term are now on file in the social science department, available for all U.S. history and other classes at no charge. The Educational Coordinating Council might obtain fruitful results from funding a project which would bring instructors, students, and audio-visual aid experts together to build files of student-made films in various fields of study. This class found it to be a stimulating, absorbing, and productive adventure for good students as well as for students who might not ordinarily have become involved.[11]

Handouts. Some criteria for using handouts were developed as the year progressed. Though most of these criteria were the standard criteria for such aids, the most important guidelines came from classroom experience and each particular set of needs and problems, as it arose. It was discovered, for example, that the use of handouts was more of a detriment than a help unless 1) there were no other forms of information purveyed that would do the job better; 2) they were brief enough to be easily read; 3) they were prepared with the attributes of economy and visual impact in mind; and 4) they were used in some way (introduction of material, analysis, criticism) at the same time and in the same class in which they were handed out.

---

[11] Costs can be pared with this method. In calculations the total cost of student filming for both terms (approximately $95) and balancing this against the cost of projected film rentals (approximately $10 per film or $60 for 6 films) used over the period of both terms, the least costly procedure seems to be rental. But the impact of the two student-made films was approximately that which might have been achieved through the use of good Life magazine or Rand-McNally films produced within the last five years costing anywhere from $25 to $50 each to rent and somewhere over $300 each to buy.

Not all of the handouts fitted the above criteria. When they did, they were advantageous from an instructional standpoint in both the large and the small classes. In the large class it was felt they were best used as diagrammatic, or tabular, or definitive illustrations of lecture material; in the small class they were best used when they reproduced selected segments of original sources such as Lincoln's Second Inaugural Address or Wilson's dialogue with the Black leaders. With class contact hours reduced these supports came to be viewed as a necessary adjunct to both formal and informal class sessions. However, student evaluations of their effectiveness were less positive than the instructor's and it may be that other kinds of illustrative materials such as acetate overlays would serve better.

Tests. If there was any single area where student morale was most at stake, and expectedly so, it was in the area of testing. No matter how many techniques were used to help encourage student participation and involvement and to reduce the threat of the large class and the lecture system, grading carried with it institutional and outside pressures which were nearly impossible to overcome. One approach might have helped, that of using behavioral objectives in grading--i.e., awarding grades on the basis of the number of objectives students acceptably achieved. They were not used because they had not been pre-tested, and it was not clear how much additional preparation this method would require in a program that was already demanding a substantial departure from institutional norms.[12] Thus, the instructor was thrown back on the older, qualitative point system of grading. The task, then, was to use this system in a more profitable and less threatening way than is generally the case.

The forms of testing used usually included a combination of general essay and objective questions designed to measure the extent to which students were achieving course objectives. All questions were taken directly from topics and names on both the weekly study guides and the reading study guides. In this way, students were always aware of the questions that might be asked. The tests themselves provided students with a choice of essay questions upon which to write. Grading was done by the two teaching assistants who graded and commented on each test; the instructor then reviewed the tests before they were handed back. A system of points was used with the total number of points calculated as letter grades for the final report. "Make-ups" were possible throughout the term. Thus, students knew at all times what the nature of the tests would be, what their point accumulation was, and what the requirements were for each of the available letter grades "A" through "F."[13]

---

[12] In the middle of spring term a feasible plan came to our attention which had been tested and could have been adapted to our needs, but by then it was too late. See Kenneth Woodbury, Jr., "Systems Approach to Western Civilization," Junior College Journal, March 1971, pp. 72-80.

It was felt that the testing should have been on a weekly basis for all the reasons that learning psychologists suggest: immediate reinforcement, concept development, and practice. However, administrative difficulties, teaching assistant schedules, and student resistance to the idea led to the giving of tests twice or three times a term as mid-terms and finals. Results on these tests were generally good; very few students received "F's." In general, a slight difference was detected in test performance scores from other classes taught previously by the class instructor. There were outstanding performances and poor performances in about the proportion one might expect in any course where grade points and curves are used. "B" work, however, seemed more prevalent during spring term. This tendency seemed to be due to 1) the use of study guides which gave the students a basis for test-oriented study, and 2) the practice of calculating a significant, though not unusually large number of drop-outs each term as part of the total grade curve. On the whole, it was felt that the testing program met fairly well the currently expressed student needs for predictability, infrequency, and optional make-ups without sacrificing performance standards in any way.

---

[13] One option winter term left it up to the student to take a final exam during the normally-scheduled time; if he was not satisfied with his grade after the second mid-term, he could take the final and have the two highest test scores of the three averaged together for his final number of points. This was intended for the student's benefit, but it appeared to most students to be a punishment for not having scored well enough on the two mid-terms. There were many complaints, especially from those whose cumulative marks were close to the border of the next highest grade. This feedback led to a more successful option spring term.

## The Small Class--Peer Discussion Group

Whereas the purpose of the large class was primarily to provide a variety of educational experiences for the class as a whole, the purpose of the small class, or discussion group, was to provide an opportunity for individual participation in the total educational experience. Basic assumptions to this idea were 1) that students could gain confidence in their own capacities for mastering the material if they could ask questions and discuss problems of comprehension with their peers; 2) that a well-directed use of original sources (excerpts from speeches, documents, letters, etc.), chosen to lead students inductively to basic themes, concepts, and events in American history, could be accomplished with greater effectiveness in small discussion groups; 3) that peer exchange and group association could produce in students a more comfortable, less threatened attitude toward the course and hence toward its content (the dynamics of socializing content that Bruner and others speak of);[14] 4) that the above assumptions could not be fairly tested unless the instructor were removed from an active leadership role in the discussion groups; and 5) that students themselves could be sufficiently trained in course content and teaching techniques to make satisfactory discussion leaders. It was felt that the discussion group experience would support what went on in the large class very much as the large class supported what went on in the groups; thus, it was hoped that the discussion group experience would substantially aid students in achieving the overall objectives of the grant. In short, it was assumed that the discussion group under student leadership was the heart of the experiment.

---

[14] Bruner, op cit., pp. 124-126.

Discussion Leaders Selection. Obviously, the selection of well-qualified discussion leaders was crucial to success. Certain criteria were agreed upon and application forms were prepared incorporating some of these criteria: age, year in college, academic major, and performance level or grade point average (GPA).

In asking these kinds of questions, the staff was making the following assumptions about selection criteria: 1) that older students could generally be considered more mature and conscientious, 2) that second-year or transfer students, regardless of age, would have the advantage of being better oriented to college life, 3) that social science majors with an interest either in history or education were likely to be somewhat better motivated toward such a program, and 4) that students who had a good academic record should be capable of mastering the necessary material.

There were other, less tangible, criteria--personality factors, emotional stability, enthusiasm, communicative abilities, articulateness--which were of obvious importance but which had to be assessed through interviews rather than questionnaires.

Interviews were set up, during which information was obtained about the applicant's previous experience, his educational aims, and his reasons for applying. He was also asked whether he planned to stay the full year, as it was felt he should serve a whole year in the interest of leadership continuity. Information from each interview was jotted down and attached to the application forms. Other instructors with whom the applicant had been acquainted were also interviewed. Each member of the staff then read over the accumulated information, and from their evaluations, together with those of the instructor, finalists were chosen and asked to come back for an interview with the whole staff. Discussion leaders were selected from this interview.

Admittedly, the process was impressionistic, but given the short time in which the screening had to be done (during the first three weeks) and the slow response to it among students (many of them, it seemed, had been reluctant to apply because they assumed from the application form that the leaders must be "brains"), the selection resulted in what proved to be a capable and conscientious group of students.

Thirteen were chosen the first term to handle an enrollment of 123 students, resulting in one leader for approximately every ten students and two back-up leaders who could fill in for others under special circumstances. All of the 13 chosen were older students ranging in age from 18 to 35 and averaging 23 years of age. All were second-year college students or transfers with junior or senior standing, i.e., students well oriented to college life. Four new selections had to be made during the year: three during winter term when enrollment for the year was at its peak (158), and one during spring term when one of the back-up leaders dropped out of school. These replacements were also older, more mature students. Continuity was thus achieved and, partially because of it, a certain esprit de corps developed among the leaders.

Leader Seminars. The historian Carl L. Becker once said, "The inner core of higher learning is the seminar." To rob the phrase of some of its nobility but none of its essence, the discussion leader seminar was felt to be in this case the "inner core" of the experiment; in and through it, the limits of student leadership potential were probed, and the effective levels of content presentation and complexity tested.

The concrete purpose of the leaders' seminar was threefold: 1) to acquaint discussion leaders with pedagogical methods, devices, and techniques which might help them to involve their students in class discussion, 2) to enrich and deepen the discussion leaders' understanding of course materials through selected reading and through an exchange of ideas with the instructors, and 3) to expose discussion leaders to instruction and reading in the methods historians use to record and interpret the past.

The first of these purposes was based on the assumption that student leaders would gain confidence in proportion to the knowledge they acquired of devices and techniques available to lead discussions. The second purpose was based on the belief that bright, mature students would benefit from a deeper exposure to course materials, and through it could help enrich his students' understanding as well. The third purpose rested on the assumption that a knowledge of the methods of historical research would help the discussion leader both to understand the extra reading and to organize the research projects spring term. The following description deals with the pedagogical content of the seminar which was the responsibility of the instructor.

Chief among the techniques used to teach pedagogy was that of making the seminar itself a model of what the leaders might expect in class. The instructor acted as a discussion leader. At appropriate junctures, the various techniques that had been used to encourage participation were analyzed and discussed. These techniques need not be described in detail here; they were the standard techniques used by teachers since Socrates.[15] The point is that no single one of them was used; instead, several and sometimes all of them were used, depending on the kind of discussion material at hand and its purpose in the learning situation.

By winter term, the more conscientious leaders (a large majority) had become confident as well as competent enough to be able to develop their own styles, techniques, and approaches.[16] By this time almost all of them had built up a comfortable rapport with their fellow students so that very few on-going students requested different leaders for winter or spring terms even though there were provisions made for them to do so. The attitude of discussion leaders at the beginning of winter term was one of enthusiasm and anticipation reinforced by their sense of having been successful.

---

[15] These techniques were: the questioning dialogue (the technique built upon deductive methods leading from assumptions to inferences), discovery questioning (inductive methods leading from commonly shared facts to general theories and conclusion), the argumentative monologue (taking an unpopular stand being a "devil's disciple"), the transference of authority (taking the posture of being uninformed or confused and in need of the group's help), the use of analogy (building a new concept by analogy from more commonly shared experiences with which the student is familiar), role playing (letting the students play at being historical or symbolic figures), content games (letting the student play "what if?"), and role denial (abdicating one's role as discussion leader, thereby imposing tension on the group so that some one or several others will move to fill the role--often called by our leaders "the shock treatment").

[16] One discussion leader organized debates, another used a modified team-teaching technique with some of his better students, another used a problem-solving approach assigning special research, and still another went to great pains preparing simulations of actual events.

This does not mean that the leaders' seminar could be considered an unqualified success; indeed, some important qualifications should be made. It was found that early expectations for discussion leaders were too high. For example, the first discussion was on the relationship between the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution; but, in spite of the fact that discussion leaders were familiar with both documents, they were not capable of manipulating what they had learned about the relationship between them in any other way than the way in which they had learned it in the seminar. The result was that discussion leaders tended to revert to "canned" lectures of what they had learned, which was the very thing it was hoped they would avoid. The problem was attributed to three things: 1) discussion leaders' inexperience and insecurities, 2) too high a level of abstraction in the instructor's presentation of materials, and 3) too large a reading assignment.

Adjustments were made gradually in all of these areas until by winter term an optional formula had apparently been produced: readings were limited to two or three articles or segments of books (usually from good anthologies or "readings" books) which illustrated only the most important aspects of a particular topic. Interpretive sources were limited to not more than two, and, when original sources were used, they were edited to preserve only the bare essentials. The instructor also used more concrete examples and illustrations of materials during the seminar discussions, stopping more often to make sure everyone understood. In addition, discussion leaders were encouraged to talk with the instructor during the week, and additional office hours were added to facilitate consultation.

Toward the middle of winter term a balance was achieved between "input" and "output" which encouraged deeper exposure and wider reading, though "canned" lectures in the discussion groups were never completely eliminated. Still, the degree to which the leaders were able to manipulate and translate material for their students was observably greater than it had been before, particularly during the last part of winter term.

Student response on the winter term questionnaire did not wholly agree with this concept of the discussion groups. Between the two questionnaires administered fall term, the second one had revealed a sizable increase over the first questionnaire in the percentage of those who favored the general format of the course once discussion groups had become operative. Yet, the questionnaire taken winter term showed only lukewarm response to these student-led groups. Some discussion leaders were scored high, some low; but, on the average, most of them were scored as only moderately helpful leaders. Among the negative comments, the most persistent one was "insufficient leader training." Since other aspects of the course seemed to be operating successfully and discussion groups were not, in the main, evaluated as unsuccessful, the instructor continued with the seminar as it had developed up until that time and, instead, began to visit groups more frequently. Given the overall demands of the course, further leadership training, either by increasing the number of hours given over to the seminar, or by increasing the instructor's effort and preparation, was deemed impossible. For teachers wishing to institute this kind of program, a summer training session for discussion leaders might be in order, with credit arrangements provided. The project staff were not discouraged even without such a session since one of their purposes in selecting the leaders was to provide for a carry-over of experienced people for the coming year. It is their contention that better training will be the result of having a core of trained leaders to build around.

## Enrollment and Attendance

It was assumed that enrollment figures each term would give a reliable indication of the "holding power" of the course and indirectly the success of the project from term to term. In that respect it was encouraging to see that only 12 of the 123 students withdrew from the class during the fall term, and the enrollment in winter term was up 25 percent. The spring term enrollment, traditionally down at Lane, was slightly less than winter term, but only by 4 percent, and, as in preceding terms, the same students tended to come back to the same leaders.

Nonetheless, attendance was low in several discussion groups until some measures were taken to gear tests more specifically to discussion material thereby integrating discussion material more with the general course material. Yet the instructor and staff never felt justified in requiring attendance, principally because they felt it served no useful purpose to force students who either from a lack of interest or an abundance of knowledge did not wish to attend. Clearly a part of the student morale would have been sacrificed as well as one of the tools for measuring the group's impact--the degree of interest shown by voluntary attendance.

During spring term the format of discussion was fundamentally changed from a structure of participation through reading and discussion to one of participation through research. Each group chose a major problem or topic for its project and each individual in the group was to take up one aspect of the major problem or topic and contribute his own findings to the whole. The completed project was then to be presented by the group in any form or with whatever media the group desired. Aside from the instructional objective of exposing students to historical research methods, the whole program was designed to try to infuse variety (Objective C of the Grant Proposal) into the discussion group's experience (Objective B of the Grant Proposal).

Attendance in the discussion groups rose during spring term. This was partly due to the fact that a large part of the term's grade was dependent on these projects. Students could do independent written projects if they wished but only four students chose to do so; the rest worked within the group structure. Attendance was not only higher but more regular than at any other time during the year. Discussion leaders themselves became deeply involved. They were originally suppose to serve as "ombudsmen" for their groups, relaying problems, providing organizational help, and serving as resource persons. As it turned out, many of them went beyond these duties to help with the actual research and presentation. The chief problem became one of discouraging discussion leaders from taking too heavy a burden of their projects while less-motivated students were allowed to shunt their obligations. Inevitably, the talented and well-motivated students did the lion's share, but the minor contributors were far fewer in number than were the non-attenders of the previous two terms, indicating that a significant number (somewhere around 15 percent) who had not been at all involved in discussions during the first two terms did become involved in the last term's work.

Despite this apparent improvement in student support, the spring term questionnaire revealed an opposite reaction.[17] It was clear from student responses on this questionnaire that attendance had been improved solely because of the threat of grades. In fact, most student responses showed that the spring term research project was felt to be less useful than the discussions of the previous two terms. The major reason was that students found the projects less related to what went on in the other sessions. However, even though fewer students supported the projects, those who did were more emphatic in their approval. Perhaps alternatives to research should have been offered in each group, e.g., a mixed group with some in research and some in discussion or some doing a book review or something like it. The idea had been suggested but there seemed to be too many difficulties in administering such a program within the framework of the project.

Two clear points emerged from these evaluations: 1) attendance figures alone were not an accurate indicator of student interest or support, and 2) a majority of students approved or disapproved of the discussion groups purely on the basis of whether they were useful to them in achieving grades whether they involved students in personal interaction and participation or not. It was seen from other questionnaire responses that student interaction and participation were considered by students to be important and had, in fact, been achieved in the course; but, by spring term, it was apparent that this had been accomplished more through the instructor-student relationships which had been established in the large class and in office hours. This forced a change in some of the assumptions about the role of discussion groups in general.

---

[17] See Chapter III, p. 60 ff.

During the spring term the projects produced some excellent work. The films which two of the groups made have already been mentioned. In addition, the projects produced: 1) some valuable acetate transparencies of the 1920's, 2) several slides of old homes in Eugene and the new developments which replaced them, 3) a slide and acetate transparency program on the history of "women's liberation," and 4) a unique experiment in multi-media work which was held at night for the benefit of several interested instructors.

Seven of the projects were presented to the class as a whole. When measured by attendance, the results were disappointing, but when measured in terms of quality, the results were gratifying. Four of the presentations were of outstanding quality, one was quite good, one mediocre, and one quite poor (inadequacy of the latter, partly due to its being the first presentation, therefore, the one most pressed for time). Student response from those who attended was enthusiastic, and discussion leader evaluations were positive.

One evaluation plan failed to materialize: that of using peer and self-evaluation as a part of the grading in each group. Students resisted evaluating each other though they readily volunteered self-evaluation. As it turned out, the brunt of evaluation for individual contributions and effectiveness in the projects fell on the discussion leaders. The class, without dissent, accepted this plan as the fairest possible--an indication, it was thought, of the amount of trust students had come to place in their discussion leaders by that time.

### Evaluation: Discussion Leaders

By virtue of their unique position, discussion leaders shared the problems, viewpoints, and interests of both the instructor and the student. It was felt that their evaluation would make an especially mature appraisal--one upon which progress could be assessed and guidelines for operation provided. The results were gratifying. Two written evaluations were asked for--one at the end of fall and one at the end of winter term. A grading evaluation and an oral report were asked for spring term. The oral reports are included in the succeeding remarks.[18]

The following judgments and assessments were those shared among all the leaders: 1) The large class sessions on Monday were helpful and often gave discussion leaders a "launching pad" for discussion in their groups. 2) Friday sessions were too vaguely structured and generally ineffective first term. (Students agreed and the sessions were changed accordingly.) 3)Study guides were of primary importance both for test preparation and for discussion group topics. 4) Reserve reading for the seminar was deemed helpful, but it was felt that the assignments were burdensome during the first term, an appraisal which again led to specific changes. 5) The pedagogical part of the discussion leader seminar was considered important in that it built the structure upon which discussion would be based for each succeeding week.

---

[18] Both sets of written evaluations are in the files of the project director.

Most revealing were the discussion leaders' assessments of the discussion group experience itself. Nearly all of the discussion leaders felt that the great majority of students were interested primarily in what the discussion groups could do for their grades, not in the opportunity it afforded them for participation. Other leader reports supported this major point,--e.g., students were too often unprepared in their reading; several students always exerted pressure on the discussion leader to lecture; and attendance was always higher before tests. During spring term, when the group projects comprised one-half of the grade, the discussion leaders felt the students attended more because they attached more worth to the discussion group, yet they also felt that students truly gained more from this experience than any other. Still, in the minds of discussion leaders, the grading system was the most powerful single influence on student attendance, contribution, and participation in the discussion groups--assessments largely confirmed by the spring term questionnaire.

A very different kind of motivational force operated upon the discussion leaders themselves. For them, it was the pressure of their responsibility in guiding and helping ten to a dozen of their peers. Leaders, without exception, felt that they had learned more, accomplished more, and worked harder than at almost any time in their college careers. For them the experience was apparently deeply rewarding.

The results of the formal on-going evaluations of the course throughout the year are discussed elsewhere in this report; however, one aspect of these evaluations bore directly on course presentation and content and are thus better recounted here. Students were told that their comments were needed not only for evaluating the total experiment, but for making term-to-term changes in the course as they were warranted. It was largely due to student comments combined with student "feedback" that the test-option used second term was abandoned, that lectures became more structured during the second term, that the discussion leaders' tendency to lecture was revealed and discouraged, that study guides were handed out two weeks rather than one week in advance during winter and spring terms, and that the idea of the weekly syllabus was instituted.[19] Thus, when changes were actually made on the strength of student suggestions, students themselves acquired a sense of "having a say" both in what was being taught and in how it was being taught--a positive factor in maintaining a student morale.

## Administrative Considerations

The administration of the course was facilitated vastly by the cooperation of the social science department chairman, Mr. Beals; the assistant dean of instruction, Mr. Rasmussen; the dean of instruction, Dr. Case; the scheduling secretary, Miss Piercy; the disbursement and pay director, Mr. Douda; and the academic and classified staff of the social science department. No radically new course can be wholly trouble-free, but, thanks to the combined help of these persons many problems were solved almost as soon as they arose. The only major administrative difficulty worth mentioning was that of scheduling.

The source of the problem was the printed time schedule from which students registered at the beginning of each term. There seemed to be no way to describe the course so that it would appear to be simply a regular undergraduate survey course in American history. The first term's schedule carried a footnote next to the class time which said "extra hours required." Student feedback later suggested that this footnote discouraged some students who might otherwise have registered.

---

[19] See footnote 13.

The schedule was changed for winter term with the full cooperation of the registrar's office. The main Monday-Friday lecture period was listed on a single line, but unlike the fall schedule each of the 14 available discussion hours on Tuesday and Wednesday were listed below it. Though there is no specific way of knowing enough student comment was heard to indicate that the increased enrollment winter term might have been even greater had the course not appeared so complicated to register for in comparison with other history courses on the same schedule. No alternative for spring term suggested itself, and, again, there is no way of knowing precisely how much influence the schedule had on the slightly lower enrollment that term, except through some feedback.

Admittedly, student feedback is by nature imprecise, but it was persistent enough to justify our noting that any variations from the normal, small class structure of the community college curriculum stood out glaringly and often confusingly in the college time schedule. Anyone incorporating new approaches that involve radically different scheduling must try to solve this problem at an early date.

## Instructor Evaluation

There were three major evaluative considerations relating to the overall objectives of the Grant Proposal which were wholly within the instructor's purview: 1) the degree to which instructor efficiency was improved, 2) the instructor's perception of the extent to which his effectiveness was improved, and 3) the instructor's professional judgment of the total worth of the experiment.

### Instructor Efficiency

The goals set by Objective D of the Grant Proposal to improve instructor efficiency were realized with minor qualifications. The exact formula outlined under part 2 of Objective D was followed, resulting, for the most part, in the savings in time predicted under part 2, subsection f.[20] One exception was that office hours were not as efficacious as they might have been. Some kind of package learning for certain segments of course work not covered in class might have increased the efficacy of the office hours, as could the imposition of appointment schedules; but, in the interests of student morale which, according to questionnaire responses, hinged partly on an easy, informal access to the instructor, neither of these strategems was employed.

In another related area, administrative details of varying kinds--departmental reports, student "adds" or "drops," discussion group time changes (when they became necessary), student record tabulations, etc.--all came to the instructor's office at times other than those when the two teaching assistants on the staff were available. As a result, these tasks, originally intended for them, had to be handled by the instructor. To compensate, teaching assistants were given more tasks related to the class period itself including lectures and panel discussions. As it turned out, this change proved beneficial; it added variety to the course presentation and was popular among students.

---

[20] See Objective D, Grant Proposal.

Some remarks are in order about the teaching assistants. It was extremely fortunate for the staff (and course) to have attained the two that it did. Both had impressive credentials to begin with, but they added to them immeasurably through their innovative and energetic help.[21] They took on the major portion of grading and the responsibility for arranging audio-visual materials and aids. They made effective and well-prepared classroom presentations and became very helpful counselors for students; students, in turn, came to respect their advice and to rely upon their assistance. Planning, implementation, and evaluation of the course would have been difficult if not impossible without them.

Such assistance would be valuable, but not essential for perpetuating this format in years to come, the reason being that their work provided enough materials, enough precedents for handling students and classes, and enough ideas concerning the future of the program that their duties can be absorbed by the instructor. It is recommended, however, that some qualified assistant be employed during the first year by any school wishing to implement such a project, or that some compensation be made to an instructor for summer time preparation which this kind of program would demand.

---

[21] Robert Ashton--MAT in history from Johns Hopkins University, one year of high school teaching in American history, progress toward PhD in Russian history.

Nancy Smith--Honors graduate at the University of Oregon, work on her MA thesis, 2 years experience as a teaching fellow at the University of Oregon, student teaching in the Eugene secondary schools.

### Instructor Effectiveness

Students were asked to assess instructor effectiveness through questionnaires; discussion leaders had to do the same as a part of their end-of-term reports.[22] This segment is the instructor's self-evaluation of what he considered to be the impact of this program on his effectiveness--i.e., of the program's impact on the instructor's energy, enthusiasm, and interest, without which instructor effectiveness is undermined.

The fact that there were no repetitive class sessions was of utmost importance as it allowed time for other and more varied tasks and removed the drudgery of repetition. In the large class, both the highly strutured and the loosely structured sessions needed careful planning. As mentioned earlier, these needs were partially sacrificed to the needs of discussion leaders and the discussion leader seminar during the first term. Once a balance was achieved, however, the preparation time for the large class increased and sessions improved. At the same time extensive personal contact with students during office hours operated to "personalize" the class for the instructor as well as for the student. From an instructor standpoint the "feel" of the class improved due to a growing sense of mutual trust and of shared concerns which seemed to make the class personally responsive, attentive, and receptive to changing topics and themes. It is the instructor's impression that these things were mostly the result of his opportunity to focus on one class rather than several.

---

[22] See Chapter III, p. 60 ff.

The single class format had other advantages as well. For one thing, guest lectures and panels could be easily scheduled without repetition. Also it helped produce a sense of instructional continuity which, together with the variety of instructional contacts with students in the large class, the small class, the seminar, and in office hours involving students working with the same general material and participating in the same class experience, created a feeling of excitement which translated a whole new set of instructional problems into challenges to be met rather than obstacles to be overcome.

In a curriculum where repetitive lecture and class sessions are the rule (i.e., the small class curriculum), interest inevitably lags not from yearly repetition of the course, but from multiple repetition of the same course throughout the year. This is a recognized threat to instructor morale. In the present program, however, instructor interest was not only sustained but nurtured by his being able to concentrate on the historical process unbroken by repetition and undiluted by multiple focus.

## Special Evaluation: Course Content and Instructional Objectives

Aside from measuring course objectives through the student's performance on tests, the instructor developed a course content and instructional objectives questionnaire at the end of the year designed to test the student's grasp of the historical process at work in the history of the United States and the recurrent themes that emerge from that process. The same questionnaire asked the students to record their impressions of what the instructor did in class--i.e., what they perceived his teaching methods to be--in order to compare these impressions with what the instructor himself had set out to do and what he thought he had actually done.[23]

The first set of questions (part II of the questionnaire) were designed to obtain the students' impression of how much emphasis the instructor placed upon either 1) the development of critical capabilities among the students, or 2) the telling of information and explaining of materials, concepts, and ideas, or 3) the demonstration of conceptual relationships. The way in which students responded indicated they either did not understand the instructions, or they did not understand the questions, or they could not distinguish between instructional strategems. If any general result can be noted, it was that students felt the instructor's primary emphasis was placed on explaining things to them and secondarily on demonstrating conceptual relationships. In their minds, the least amount of emphasis among the three was placed upon development of critical capabilities among students. Again, these distinctions are not clear, but the tendency mentioned did show up.

For our purposes, the second set of questions (part III) was more important; also, fortunately, there was less ambiguity and less chance of misinterpretation here. The five questions in this part were more closely related to instructional objectives than to instructional methods. Without analyzing the data to obtain standard deviations or correlational criteria, the results showed in general, that objectives which it was felt a survey course in U.S. history should accomplish had been accomplished, at least for roughly 70 percent of those responding (who represented approximately 65 percent of the class).[24]

---

[23] See Course Content Questionnaire, Appendix B also, Infra., Chapter II, pp. 7-9.

Although the results largely speak for themselves, a few comments might prove useful. The responses that the majority chose in answering questions 4 through 6 represented precisely the instructional objectives aimed for. In questions 7 and 8, both answers A and B represented instructional objectives, but in a relationship of primary and secondary emphasis; in each question the greatest number of students chose the primary instructional objective over the secondary objective.

Perhaps the most gratifying results from an instructional standpoint were obtained from the course content portion of the questionnaire. Here the object was to probe for the kind of generalizations students might have acquired through the course, or from earlier history courses, or from general knowledge reaffirmed through the course. The method used was to ask the students to match certain general themes treated in class with the specific periods of American history during which these themes might have been dominant and to explain their choices. More than one, and up to three themes could be chosen for any one period. Most students did not take the time to explain their choices; but all respondents did fill in the matching portion of the questionnaire.

---

[24] The questionnaire was filled out during the final exam Since those who did not respond included several who had taken the test early, as well as a few who were exempt from taking it, and several more who had other tests to take that day and did not have the time to fill it in, there seemed to be no reason to assume this percentage would have been altered radically if the whole class had responded. This was especially true since among those who did not respond were students with a wide cross-section of earned grades from A through D and an equally wide variation in interest from non-attenders through those who never missed a class.

Student choices were color-coded on a master sheet. The pattern of these choices, again without detailed analysis, tended to reveal significant agreement with the themes as they were emphasized in class. For example, the colonial period was treated in class as one in which all of the themes mentioned could be observed. On the questionnaire, student choices reflected that no one was misled into thinking the period was also a time of awakening world leadership. The appearance on the questionnaire of the revolutionary period led to the obvious choice of the theme of revolution, but the themes of reform and incipient nationalism were chosen as well, both of which had been emphasized in class.

Moving further, a student's common-sense assumptions might not have led him to choose "divisiveness" over "imperialism" as the major theme of the period of manifest destiny; yet the class approach to manifest destiny was to treat it as the harbinger of the great sectional conflict--a case in which the acquisition of vast new lands thrust the question of slavery and freedom irrevocably into American politics where tremendously divisive forces were set in motion. Again, the gradations of choice for themes representing the period of industrialism were almost the mirror of our presentation of that unit in class. Choices under the periods of the Spanish-American War and the Progressive era reflected similar patterns. America's disillusionment with world leadership was shown by student choices under the 1920's and the Depression decade, as the growth of reform spirit was shown during the New Deal. The emphasis in class on the American acceptance of world responsibility after World War II was likewise revealed, as was the increasing awareness among Americans of a basic imbalance between the demands of liberty and the need for order during the present period.

The results, again, were not subjected to vigorous analysis, largely because a questionnaire designed for sophisticated statistical compilations would have been too time-consuming and expensive to prepare for the kind of information deemed desirable. What seemed to emerge from the questionnaire was the fact that a significant number of students absorbed some measurable knowledge which allowed them to accurately generalize about the thematic significance of major periods of American history. Since the course had deliberately been organized to reiterate themes, with the hope that students might see in these recurrent themes the relationship of past to present, it was felt that the overall aim of the course had been achieved. Whether this achievement was the result of the instructional program or not was beyond our capacity or purpose to show, but there is a justifiable inference that such a relationship existed.

## CONCLUSIONS

The conclusions and recommendations which summarize the entire report stem from data analysis and the combined judgment of the project evaluator and the instructor. The conclusions presented here are merely designed to supplement and amplify the final conclusions and recommendations; judgments made are in the context of what went on in the course on a day-to-day basis.

The central hypothesis which the project was designed to test was whether a large class could be taught without undermining student morale or performance. The basic assumptions of educators and students alike were that the two main threats to student morale in a large class were 1) student anonymity and 2) the student's inability to participate actively in the learning process. Thus, the method used to test the main hypothesis was to reconstruct the large class in such a way as to eliminate these two threats.

As reported in this narrative, student anonymity was attacked by radically extending office hours and by conducting classes as informally as course structure and content presentation would allow. Both of these procedures were aimed at increasing individual student-teacher dialogue. As the questionnaires show, these methods were successful; none of the respondents felt the project class produced any feelings of student anonymity.

The problem of the students' inability to participate in the learning process was attacked at two levels: 1) through the use of the questionnaires as vehicles through which student opinion could become a force for altering certain aspects of the course, and 2) through the use of small discussion groups. There were two types of discussion group activity used during the year: 1) student exchange on assigned reading and course materials and 2) problem solving through group research projects. Although the evaluation and questionnaires did not agree, the instructor judged the problem-solving approach most successful in terms of student interest and participation. This assessment was largely because more real student interest was engendered by tasks than by talk. As has been mentioned, more students approved of the talk sessions, but their approval was not nearly as emphatic.

From an instructor standpoint, the problem-solving approach was more profitable and more beneficial to learning. There was greater attendance in these sessions because grades were attached to the projects. In the instructor's judgment, the chief drawback was in failing to reach this larger number with the group task idea, not in substituting this idea for the talk sessions. One highly positive result of the experience was the number of alternatives it forced the staff to come up with which can be used in the future. The talk sessions were not considered a mistake; they drew out those who found discussions profitable and thus opened up alternatives to several students who would not have benefited from lectures alone, nor participated as much in the large class. One overriding consideration must be kept in mind: student response to questions about the discussion periods proposed only means of changing them not of eliminating them, or of substituting something else for them. Also, students who didn't like to attend these discussions simply stayed away. Few suggested there should be a return to three large class sessions per week, and scarcely anyone advocated returning to the older small-class format.

In the final analysis, student response clearly showed that the project course offered ample opportunity for participation to all those who wished to participate, and that the alternative of discussion groups was considered by all to be better than a third class session.

Thus, the course project eliminated the two assumed threats to student morale inherent in the large class. Student response was favorable and neither performance nor content was sacrificed. Teacher efficiency was increased as well as teacher effectiveness, mostly in the vital area of student-teacher contact. On the basis of these results, it is recommended that school administrators provide room in both their curriculums and in their planning of facilities for large class formats.

Some instructors are better equipped and better motivated for large lectures than they are for small classroom exchanges. This large class unquestionably provided for a more efficient use of the teacher's time and as a consequence may have resulted in saving taxpayers' money; and since student morale and performance can be maintained in a large class, it is recommended that administrators maintain a flexible outlook about class size. The course methods described in this report provide a basic format from which teachers accustomed to the large class environment and temperamentally suited for it, can construct a course satisfactory to teachers, taxpayers, and students alike.

# CHAPTER III

# AN INDEPENDENT EVALUATION OF THE LARGE CLASS PROJECT

To arrive at an independent evaluation of the project (see Statement of the Problem, Objectives and Evaluation, Abstract of the Proposal), the principal investigator depended most heavily upon the analysis of the responses to a series of four questionnaires. In addition, he drew upon information derived from observation of the class-room situation, selected interviews with students and staff, and recorded information such as student grades.

It is the intent of this chapter to review briefly the major and minor objectives of the project and cite the sources (as well as limitations) of data that were used to assess the degree of accomplishment of these objectives. Then before treating the findings fully, a brief section will be inserted that makes some general comments about the use of the four questionnaires among other things, as well as a brief section describing the general student profile of those students registered for the large class during the three academic terms of the duration.

## Sources of Data in Light of Project Objectives

The major objective was to maintain student morale and performance in a class format more conducive to instructor efficiency and effectivess than the usual format--i.e., three lecture classes a week.[1] It was assumed, in fact, that decreasing the time (and energy) required to make repetitive presentations in the form of class lectures and using the time saved to lengthen office hours for the purpose of increasing the availability of the instructor for one-to-one contact between students and instructor, that student morale and performance would increase.[2]

Student performance was evaluated in part by the grade distribution of students during the three terms in the U. S. History Project as compared to the grade distributions of students having the same instructor in previous courses in this subject taught under the standard format (i.e., five three-hour courses per term). Obviously, this evaluation is not based on a traditional experimental design (control/experimental groups taught by the same instructor).[3] This kind of exploration procedure was the only practical approach available.

---

[1] It is assumed that morale and performance are interrelated. It would be difficult to assume in general that a student who lacks hope or confidence in his ability to perform academically in a particular course or subject would in fact achieve a satisfactory grade (defined as C or better) in a given course or subject. It is further assumed that a student's confidence would be demonstrated in his level of reported enthusiasm for the large class project and/or the instructor in addition to his achievement as measured by course grades.

[2] To clarify a bit more, it was assumed that if instructor time is more efficiently utilized by eliminating repetitive activities and that time is used for such things as student conferences--helping students with academic problems in a genuine manner--that teacher effectiveness would increase with tangible positive results in student performance. Again the ability to demonstrate this as well as the general attempt to demonstrate the direct relation between teaching-learning is difficult, to say the least. The softness of our data is an admitted drawback. (See Chapter I, Review of Related Research.)

Another aspect of the evaluation of student performance was the maintenance of attendance records in gross terms only. That is, at various times (usually once a week) a head count was made in the large class meeting, and this count was compared to the actual enrollment according to the official records of the registrar's office. In addition, the "turnover rate" was recorded from term to term; that is, the registrar's records were examined to see how many students shifted out of the project to another section of U. S. history at Lane between fall and winter term and again between winter and spring term. Since the practice of dropping and adding courses by students is a normal phenomenon at Lane, it was anticipated that the number of such students might be a high percentage (10 to 20 percent) of total enrollment.

In addition, self-report attendance information was collected from the students with specific reference to their attendance in the small discussion groups. This was cross-checked with the discussion leader's attendance head counts.

---

[3] Several reasons exist for the rejection of a traditional experimental design for evaluation of the project. First, given the self-selection of courses and specific course sections at Lane, the establishment of clearly demonstrable control/experimental groups would have mitigated against student freedom to select instructors and/or sections of a course (many students work and are restricted in the time of day or days of the week they are able to meet their class obligations). Second, it was originally determined that any such project be conducted under the usual or normal constraints found in such an educational environment. Third, and perhaps most important, the whole thrust of the project was to heighten students' voluntary participation in the various project activities. Given the general restraining influence to achieve acceptable grades, the project staff did not wish to encumber students with any more institutional imposed restrictions than absolutely necessary. This was one of the reasons for not making class attendance mandatory or keeping class attendance records in the usual manner.

The major reason for the collection of attendance data at all was the assumption that attendance was an indicator of student interest. This indicator is of value only when augmented by data from the questionnaires.

There was an additional reason for making head counts of class attendance at various times. Those involved in the project wanted to know if the percentage of attendance was within the general range of attendance in social science classes taught under the regular format.

The student turnover data were collected because they were assumed to be an indicator of the holding power of the project. If the rate of students transferring from the project to a regular section of U. S. history was high, this might well indicate that the instructor and/or the project format was unacceptable to the students.[4] The degree of student participation was measured by the attendance records kept, self-report data from the questionnaire, and observations made by discussion leaders and the instructor.[5]

Morale of the students was measured primarily from the student questionnaires. (See "Student Morale" below.)

The measurement of the efficiency and effectiveness of the teacher is dependent primarily on observational data collected by the principal investigator, the questionnaires, and the assessments made by the instructor and discussion leaders.

---

[4] To determine if students who changed at term's end did change for these and/or other reasons, the principal investigator intended to interview as many of these students as possible. As discussed later, the rate was so low, this proved to be unnecessary.

[5] This aspect of the evaluation is also treated in the instructor's analysis of the project. See Chapter II.

## The Questionnaires Described[6]

A series of four questionnaires was given to students during the three academic terms during which the project was in operation. The first two questionnaires were given to students during the fall term, one before the formation of small discussion groups and one after. Questionnaire Three was given during winter term and Questionnaire Four during spring term.

The first two questionnaires were generally exploratory in nature made up essentially of open-ended questions. From the responses to these questionnaires and other information (e.g., student interview and a review of related research) the last two questionnaires were constructed.

In the last section of this chapter, specific questions from each of the four questionnaires will be discussed as to their relationship to the achievement of the project objectives. At this point, two general comments should be made in terms of the use of the questionnaires. First, all students were encouraged to fill out the questionnaires,[7] but in keeping with the voluntary nature of the project, no one was required to do so. The returns ranged between 51 and 73 percent. However, checks such as grade distribution of those responding and not responding did indicate that those responding were representative of the total number of students involved in the project. Second, it was emphasized that the questionnaires were a major means of giving feedback to those directing the project. All attempts were made to give tangible evidence to this latter point. In fact, it is safe to say that in matters of conduct of the lecture sessions and discussion groups as well as such things as course tests, the results of the questionnaires in summary form caused substantial change in aspects of format and substance.[8]

---

[6] See Appendix C. Various first-level tabulations and open-ended responses plus computer printouts on cross tabulations are on file with the principal investigator.

[7] A variety of encouragements were given at the time the questionnaires were filled out. Chief among these was the assurance of anonymity.

### General Profile of Respondents

One section of the first, third, and fourth questionnaire asked students for certain vital and academic information. To this was added their course grade from the term in which they completed the questionnaire. As stated in a prior section, the grade distribution of those responding to the questionnaire was checked against the general grade profile of all students enrolled each term to determine the degree of representativeness of those responding to the total enrolled. It was assumed during the first term that those not responding were generally students receiving grades less than C, that is, students who might attend class less regularly and who maintained, at best only marginal interest in the project. However, this check did not reveal any significant difference between the grade profile of the total enrollment and the respondents.[9]

---

[8] See Chapter II.

[9] One other check was made. The responses to certain substantive questions (in questionnaire number four) of those respondents who remained in the project all three terms were checked against the responses of all other respondents. There was no significant difference between the responses of the two groups.

At least 81 percent of the student respondents achieved a grade of C or better in each of the three terms. The majority of the respondents were male, 25 years of age or less, full-time students, graduates from large high schools (1,000 students or more) and were enrolled in the college transfer program whether or not they were working toward a degree at Lane or not. In all cases these majorities ranged from 60 to over 90 percent. The inference that can be drawn from these data is that to a large extent, the project attracted and held academically-oriented students. If this assumption is correct, the responses to some of the substantive questions especially in the third and fourth questionnaires can be explained in a more meaningful manner.

## Findings

Student performance when measured by course grades was rather striking. During the fall term, 84 of the 123 originally enrolled received a grade of C or better (68 percent). Fifty-three students received a grade of A or B. During the winter term, 108 of the 158 originally enrolled received a grade of C or better (68 percent). Seventy-seven students received a grade of A or B. During spring term, 98 of the 152 originally enrolled received a grade of C or better (64 percent). Seventy-two students received a grade of A or B.

While this grade profile is significantly higher than grade profiles given by the same instructor in previous years, this fact alone could not attest to the "success" of the project. The instructor who was also project director could have influenced the results. This possibility was discussed at great length with the instructor prior to the beginning of the project.

## Student Morale: Attendance, Attitude, and Turnover Rate

In terms of student attendance in the large group sessions, the general trend was not exceptionally better than student attendance in general at Lane.

Specifically, gross attendance ran 80 to 85 percent of actual enrollment figures. On days following major exams, attendance would drop below the 80 percent mark, sometimes as low as 60 percent. Very much the same rate of attendance was found in the small discussion groups on the basis of the self-report data in questionnaires three and four. These rates were confirmed by the informal checking of the discussion leaders.[10] It should be noted that mixed in with computed figures on attendance were the students that had withdrawn or dropped the project during each of the three terms. Even so, the rate of attendance was disappointing to those working on the project.

In discussing this matter with some students during the first part of the year, further confirmation was obtained that this attendance rate pattern was very close to that found in other college transfer courses they were registered in. Several students, independent of one another, suggested two possible explanations of this phenomenon. First they suggested that many students who were recent graduates from high school were unable to respond to a more open environment. That is, students were unaccustomed to the new-found freedom at the college level. These students, their peers were suggesting, had not yet found a compelling substitute for compulsory attendance generally experienced at most elementary and secondary schools. Put somewhat differently, some students, while enrolled in college for whatever reason, lack sufficient self-motivation to regularly participate in the activities (courses) in which they were enrolled. If this appraisal is correct, it may well be a direct reflection on the custodial care approach typical in secondary schools.

---

[10] This particular cross check lends credence to the notion that students were generally honest in their responses to the questionnaires.

The second and related point that students made on this matter was that there seemed to be a minority of students that would register at Lane with little intention of ever seriously pursuing academic studies. A part of this group in some students' judgment was a minority of those males who were eligible for the G. I. Bill. The rationale for this particular point is as follows. Given a lack of motivation and goals and/or wishing some "recovery" time (an expression used by one student), coupled with low tuition (and costs in general for those students living at home), some returning G. I.s were using their service benefits to support themselves during a period of transition, by enrolling at Lane.[11]

Because of the continued interest in attendance, this was a matter discussed at great length in the discussion leaders' seminar. Their analysis of whether or not to attempt to institute formal attendance procedures coupled with responses to the same question (questionnaire number two--question nine) by students led those in charge of the project to reject the notion. Almost all the discussion leaders and 74 percent of the respondents to the questionnaire argued against instituting formal attendance procedures. One reason that came through from both groups was that the time and effort required for such endeavor was wasteful and unproductive. That is, those who would become regular participants in the class would not increase significantly by such means and those who already were regularly attending would in the process be (as several students phrased it) "put off by the whole thing." In other words, attendance taking and compulsory attendance were elementary and high school requirements. These people were now in college. There were nevertheless a minority of the respondents who argued for required attendance with penalties grade-wise for lack of regular attendance.

---

[11] In a discussion of this point with Richard Dent, Assistant Director of College Entrance Examination Board, Western Region, California, he stated that preliminary findings from a study conducted by C.E.E.B. of community colleges in California which are operated at low tuition supports the assertions of our student informants about a minority of their peers who are under the G. I. Bill.

As suggested earlier in the report, the turnover rate of students from fall to winter terms and again winter to spring terms was obtained from the records of the college. The intent was to interview those shifting from the project to another section of U. S. history to determine their reasons. This was not done, however, because of the rather surprising results gleaned from the records. Of the 123 students originally enrolled in the fall term of the class, 69 registered for the winter. Of the 54 students who did not, 32 dropped school, 19 remained in school but took no history,[12] and only three shifted to another section.

---

[12] A spot check of these students indicated that most had already taken the winter term of U. S. history or had intended to complete their social science requirement with other courses in the Department.

The results were almost the same when the records were checked for the registration from winter to spring term. Of the original 158 registered winter term, 78 continued in the project spring term. Of the 80 students who did not, 49 dropped school, 31 remained in school but took no history (the same spot check was made with this group that was made with the same category fall to winter term--the results were the same in terms of reasons for not continuing in U. S. history), and only three shifted to another section of U. S. history.

The reasons for this high retention rate may be many, but on evaluation of the responses to the questionnaires, one very pronounced reason seems to be that the students who did not shift into another section of U. S. history found the project rewarding in terms of their general academic experience. This point must be modified, however, by other inferences drawn from the questionnaire data.

With respect to those students who dropped school, no data were collected in terms of the impact of the project on their decision. It is assumed that the project was not the sole or major reason for dropping school.

In Questionnaire One[13] given before the establishment of discussion groups, the students were asked about their impressions of large classes such as those of the project versus the usual size of class found at Lane (question 8). The majority of the respondents felt that in a large class there was less possibility of interchange with the instructor in discussion--questions and answers. As will be amplified later, this objection was not substantially overcome with the establishment of the discussion groups. The majority of students did not find student discussion leaders even in a small group setting a sufficient substitute for class contact with the instructor.

---

[13] See Appendix C. There were questions on the questionnaires asked primarily to give students an opportunity to suggest changes in project format (see questions 4 and 7, Questionnaire Two, questions 10 and 11, Questionnaire Three, question 11, Questionnaire Four). These responses were analyzed with the Project Director and discussion leaders and where possible, changes were made and students informed of this. The questions of this type from Questionnaire Two plus responses to question 11, Questionnaire One also were fruitful in suggesting new questions for succeeding questionnaires.

During the third term, when group projects became the main thrust of the small discussion groups, efforts were made to include all students in the identification, selection, and completion of the projects for some form of presentation to all students in the experiment. On the basis of observation, a considerable number of students--possibly a majority--made substantial contributions in each of the discussion sections on the group's project, but the number was short of what was expected and hoped for. One reason for this appears to be the general evaluation by the students of their discussion leaders.

Another check on participation in assumed learning activities of the course was the use of reserve readings. Originally, in designing the course, it was decided that the number of outside readings each term should be kept at a minimum, that they be specifically related to lectures and discussions, that the various handouts should reflect the substance of the course, and that some "testing" of the reserve readings be made in regular examinations. The use of these reserve materials as checked periodically by examining the checkout cards was disappointing. A regular but small group of students, no more than 20 percent including discussion leaders, took advantage of reserve readings. When students were asked in Questionnaire Four to rate various sources in order of importance both in terms of increasing their knowledge and understanding of U. S. history as well as preparation for examinations (see questions 5 and 6), the respondents rated reserve reading last in each case.

General student morale as assessed by their interest and enthusiasm for the project and/or the instructor was judged to be high. To discover if the project or the instructor originally attracted students who had heard about either, several questions were posed in the first questionnaire to determine the state of such knowledge (the instructor had been on leave from Lane the prior academic year). Specifically, when asked why they were taking U. S. history (question 1), the large majority (over 65 percent) indicated it was a requirement and/or an interest in U. S. history. A like majority indicated little prior knowledge of the nature of the project (question 3 and 4). To question 2, asking why they had signed up for the particular section that was the project, 34 percent indicated that they had known the instructor or that he had been recommended to them by a fellow student (in a few cases by their counselor).

Students were also asked for some indication of their prior experience with large classes such as the project (question 6). Nearly 60 percent indicated no prior experience, and of the remaining respondents, half of them indicated a negative experience of one kind or another while 20 percent of the total respondents indicated a favorable experience.

Students were also asked the question of whether or not they discussed the question of class size with one another. The question was raised in the general context of whether or not it was a major concern to their peers. Seventy-five percent of the respondents indicated little or no discussion of the matter. Almost without exception the responses indicated clearly that students gave little thought to the matter. A few persons added comments that in essence said that when the quality of the instructor was high, class size really did not make any difference.

On the other hand, 25 percent of the respondents did clearly indicate that small classes were important either because of the close relationship assumed to be engendered between students and instructor or because of the reputation of Lane Community College for small classes.

It should be noted that these responses were taken during the fourth week (fall term) of the project and before discussion groups were established. To two other questions on Questionnaire One (7 and 10), some revealing comments were made in terms of student reaction to the project at this early date.

Specifically, to question 7 asking the students' impressions thus far of the project, a majority of the respondents (55 percent) replied positively in various ways. Most of these comments centered around the diversity of the group of students and the quality of the instructor.

Of the remaining responses, one-half of them indicated a negative stance about the project--its size--though even here the reaction to the instructor was generally good, while the other half took what was categorized as a neutral stance of waiting to see how things progressed. Most often, this last response centered around wanting to see what developed in the discussion sections.

In response to question 10 as to whether or not at this point in time they would sign up for the project winter term, not quite 65 percent indicated that they would, while half of the remaining respondents were undecided on the basis of not knowing anything about the discussion group or being unsure about their own future at Lane. Approximately 15 percent were negative in their attitude toward the project.

When asked later in the fall term about their general impression of the large lecture class (question 1 on Questionnaire Two), 56 percent of the respondents made positive responses without reservation, while of the remaining, less than 5 percent responded in a negative fashion. The remainder, while classified as neutral for tabulation purposes, held favorable impressions of some aspects of the project, especially the instructor and his lectures.

When asked in the same questionnaire (question 10) given at the end of the fall term whether or not they would sign up for winter term, 74 percent said that they would (a check on second-term enrollment indicated all but two of these did). The remaining indicated that they would not, but all except one said they were not signing up because of one of two reasons; either they already had had the second term of U. S. history or were "dropping school."

In the following and last question (number 11) the respondents were asked if they would recommend the project to another student. All but four percent said they would and nearly all the comments centered around favorable comments about the instructor.

## Perceived Effectiveness of the Instructor and Discussion Leaders

In Questionnaire Two, additional exploratory questions were raised in terms of the large class meetings and the small discussion groups. Three questions were posed in relation to large class lectures and examinations and the access of the instructor through expanded office hours in an effort to help students on a one-to-one basis.

The results of question 1 were cited in the previous subsection and need not be commented on except as a contrast to question 3, which asked for impressions of the discussion groups. Though in terms of the post-coded categories established of positive and negative statements, positive comments were in the majority (62 percent). In many of the positive comments as well as nearly all of the negative comments, questions were raised about the competency of the discussion leaders, especially when contrasted with the major instructor. The training of discussion leaders was in early stages, but there were nevertheless enough questions raised by the student respondents for the major instructor and the principal investigator to spend more time with the discussion leaders. These responses led in part to a set of questions posed in Questionnaire Three and Four dealing specifically with student perceptions of the value of the discussion groups. But before these student perceptions and other related matters are dealt with, the remaining student evaluations from Questionnaire Two should be commented upon.

Question 5 asked for an evaluation of the major instructor's lectures. Not quite 80 percent responded positively. Generally, in the negative comments where substantive evaluation was given, as well as in some of the positive responses, was the suggestion, in essence, for greater structure in the lectures. Some of the most perceptive comments dealt with what one student called "smoothing out the flow" of the lectures. Implied in some of these remarks was the student's inability to see the continuity between individual lectures and between lectures and material in the textbook. Though these remarks were in the minority, they did indicate a need for some change in the lecture format.

In terms of the examinations during the first term, question 6 of the second questionnaire asked the students to evaluate exams in terms of fairness and appropriateness. Without exception, all respondents replied in a positive manner (even while some of those said that they simply did not like any examinations). In the following question, some suggestions referred to having more of one type of question (e.g., essay) than another type (e.g., short answer), but the major suggestion was to start exams on time.

With released classroom time, the instructor was able to increase office hours as well as make himself available for special appointments when students could not fit their schedule to his. When asked about his availability, all but one who had attempted to see him one or more times (56 percent of total respondents), found him available and willing to be of aid. In nearly all cases the aid was found to be helpful according to student report, even when it did not pertain to academic matters. The remaining respondents had made no attempt to see him on any matter.

Questionnaire Three (winter term) attempted to focus on specific aspects of the large sessions and the discussion groups. The training sessions for the discussion leaders was well along, and it was hoped that improvement would be observed in the discussion groups. The questionnaire was structured so that the project director would have student evaluation for each of the discussion leaders for diagnostic purposes.

Taking the discussion groups first, specifically the responses to the first set of three questions (part III of Questionnaire Three), the trend seems quite clearly toward the response of moderate aid (point three of a five-point scale) in the matter of aiding students in understanding the material covered in the Monday lectures and reading assignments. This was true in all groups. Only to the question of aid in preparing for the mid-term exam did the discussion groups show a generally higher evaluation with responses clustered about point two--great aid. Two of the ten discussion groups did not, however, measure up to this rating.

In the second set of three questions (part III of Questionnaire Three), the students were asked to rate their own preparation, the preparation of their peers, and the preparation of their discussion leader for the weekly discussion group. Here, despite responses to other questions, all the discussion leaders came out as best prepared, with the most students ranking all but two discussion leaders as always prepared. The respondents with great consistency ranked their peers as "prepared half the time" (point three on a five-point scale), and ranked themselves somewhat higher, the average being 3.5 on a five-point scale for all but two groups.

When these findings are viewed in the light of the responses to question 11 of the same questionnaire, the general remarks appear to sustain the responses to the first set of three questions in part III. In essence, half of those responding to question 11 (23 percent made no response at all) made negative comments about the value of the discussion groups and leaders. Some criticism was made of the leaders' preparation and the value of the groups in aiding in preparation for examination, well in line with responses to the rating scales. On the whole, those who made negative comments mentioned the discussion leader's teaching style or a preference for having the major instructor as the discussion leader.

The other half of those responding to this question (a little more than 38 percent of the total responding to the questionnaire) were generally positive in terms of their comments about the discussion groups and leaders. These comments tended to be too varied to discern any pattern of response.

To be sure that these comments were taken from those that were essentially regular attenders (those missing no more than two sessions out of ten), the students were asked to rate their attendance, and, independently, the discussion leaders were asked to rate the attendance of each of the students in their discussion group. These two ratings in the aggregate sense were remarkably close and the vast majority making responses were judged on both ratings as being in regular attendance.

To obtain a better idea of students' impressions of the general project format and the major instructor, questions 7, 8, and 10 were asked of the student on the third questionnaire. The reader should note that questions 7 and 8 were identical except that the student was asked to respond in terms of "Mr. Simpson as instructor" in question 7 and "regardless of who the instructor may be" in question 8.

Specifically, the respondents in question 7 and 8 were asked to rank four possible alternative formats including the format most commonly used at Lane--small classes meeting with a professional teacher two or three times a week.[14]

---

[14] These two questions were modified and used again in the final evaluation spring term.

At first, the results were somewhat surprising, given the nature of the mixed appraisal of the discussion groups. The majority of the respondents to both questions (52 percent in question 7 and 60 percent in question 8) rated as first choice the format that was currently being used. A small percentage (less than ten percent) ranked the format typically used at Lane as first choice (somewhat larger percentages but no more than 20 percent ranked this latter format as second or third choice). The second major first choice was the third item in each question--that is, "somewhat larger discussion groups but with the major instructor as discussion leader."

On reflection, these results, seem to indicate a high degree of student support of the project. One obvious implication that can be drawn from this particular part of the evaluation is that the participants generally favored the kind of course format developed for the project. One might infer also that while many would prefer the major instructor as discussion leader (a large majority if first and second choices were tallied together), a majority by first choice were willing to accept the present format. It would appear, however, if one could generalize from these findings, most students would prefer a mixture of large class presentations with small discussion groups led by the major instructor. Again, when seen in this light, the results of the tallies to these questions conform to the responses to other questions about the discussion groups.

This analysis is confirmed by the nature of the responses to question 10 of Questionnaire Three. The students were asked to comment about the large lecture classes. Of those responding (20 percent made comment) to this question, 91 percent made positive remarks about the large group sessions with most comments directed at the general quality of the instructor.

Still something of a puzzle at the time when the third questionnaire was analyzed was the increase in percentage of first choice (between questions 7 and 8) when the student was asked to respond to question 8 (regardless of who the instructor may be). This was one of the reasons for repeating these questions in the final evaluation.

The fourth questionnaire was designed to amplify on previous findings and to determine, insofar as possible, student appraisal of the various project devices, both as to general learning and as to achievement on examinations (see especially question 5 and 6 on the latter point).

Computer analysis of the results from Questionnaire Four provided extensive cross tabulation of items from the profile questions of students registered in the spring term with questions 1 through 7 of part III. Some further cross-tabulations were done between the course grade received at the end of the spring term and responses to questions 1 through 7, part III. Items 1 through 4 were cross-checked with large class head counts and discussion leaders' records. On this latter point, there was a high degree of correspondence between the students' self-report of attendance and the records of discussion leaders.

In all of the cross-tabulation, no significant patterns of responses emerged, even when grades were cross-tabulated with various responses in part III. This may have been due to the high percentage of grades of A, B, and C for the respondents (86 percent). However, this percentage was not abnormally high when compared to the grade profile for all students when the withdrawals were subtracted from total original enrollment. When that was done, it was found that 75 percent of those actually enrolled in the project at the time the final evaluation questionnaire was given, achieved a grade of C or better.

## Student Evaluation of Resources and Format of Course

Examination of the responses to question 5 and 6 tended to confirm the prior findings of earlier questionnaires or comply with points raised in the chapter on the review of related research. Specifically, the rankings in question 5 indicated in rank order that lectures, basic textbook (HMA), and study guides were most important in increasing knowledge and understanding of U. S. History. Those respondents that selected any of these three as first choice tended by a substantial majority to select the other two resources as second or third. The mid-term examination and reserve readings were selected least as one of the first three choices, with the other textbook and the discussion groups ranked fourth and fifth in frequency of choice among the first three choices.

Simply put, students found the lectures, required text, and the study guides--in that order--to be of primary importance for increasing their knowledge and understanding of U. S. history. This result is not surprising in that lectures were planned primarily to help students increase their knowledge and understanding of U. S. history and secondarily to pass tests. The discussion groups ranked high during the winter term only in preparing for examinations (during the third term, the discussion groups became vehicles for specialized projects that often appeared to the student respondent not directly related to the thrust of the course). This latter point was brought out in the comments under question 11b.

The results on question 6 (ranking of resources useful in preparing for an examination) were different from the results found in question 5 in the following manner. In terms of the frequency checked, the first choice was the basic textbook (HMA) followed by study guides and lectures. Again when the respondents selected one of these three resources as first choice, they tended by a large majority to select the other two as a second and third choice. This ranking is not unanticipated since the examinations are in part centered about facts and concepts found in the text and verbalized in the lectures. The study guides reflect both of these elements.

No respondents ranked the reserve readings among their first three choices, and in fact the majority of respondents ranked it last. On question 6, the discussion groups were ranked among the first three choices by a very small percentage of the respondents. As mentioned before, the spring term discussion groups were given over to special projects essentially, hence the assumed reason for its low ranking as contrasted with prior evaluations. The other textbook was ranked fourth in terms of the number of respondents marking it among their first three choices.

Another question asked related to the previous two was question 3, "Do you think that Mondays and Fridays a student can miss the large class meetings more easily than his other classes at Lane?" These two days were given over to the large group lectures and other related activities. The division of responses was nearly equal between "Yes" and "No," but the comments were most revealing. Most of those who responded "No" felt that the lectures were necessary for passing the examinations and/or because they were useful in learning more about history. Of those responding "Yes," approximately half suggested that they could miss occasionally because the textbooks and study guides permitted them to "catch up". These reasons coupled with the idea that friends who did attend would share their notes covered about three-quarters of those indicating "Yes." The remainder interpreted the question as meaning being able to "get away with it" because no roll was taken. The cross-tabulation on the basis of grades of the respondents at the end of spring term revealed no pattern. As many C students in proportion to total C's given divided themselves between the two responses as students receiving A's and B's who responded.

When these responses are tallied by type of comment, the findings do not contradict the ratings related to the importance of the lecture in questions 5 and 6.

When the results were tallied for question 7 and 8, something of the same pattern developed as in the third evaluation. In the fourth questionnaire, an attempt was made to clarify the choices somewhat. In both questions, regardless of whether the instructor was specified or not, the majority (over 60 percent in both cases) opted for the class format in use. Also the majority of the respondents (over 60 percent in question 7 and a little over 50 percent in question 8 ) ranked the "usual format for Lane" last. In question 7 where the instructor was specified, the third item (small discussion groups led by the major instructor) was the second choice by 20 percentage points over the second item (meeting three times a week in the large group). The response to the same two items on question 8 was much less clear-cut. Approximately the same percentage of the respondents selected each of them as second and/or third choice.

The comments related to first and fourth choice were revealing. As stated earlier, the evaluator was puzzled at the lack of difference between the two questions when the instructor was specified in one but not the other. It was hoped that the impact of the instructor could have been filtered out and thereby facilitate a more accurate judgment of students' preferences for one format as opposed to the others. The comments revealed that many students lacked adequate experience with the kind of format used in the project to respond without reference to the major instructor. Some students appeared not to have read the questions carefully. A few thought them to be identical questions.

The rejection of the "usual format" by the majority in both questions was essentially due to two primary reasons. First, students apparently perceived a lack of diversity in the "usual format." It must be granted that students who were willing to participate actively in the project over the three terms could easily find a number of different things to be involved in, even including becoming an alternate discussion leader. The second thing that came out of the comments was the notion that there were many "usual format" classes. Why not maintain the project that had a different format? These two kinds of comments would appear to argue for diversity within a class (any class) and diversity among various class (course) offerings.

Two other questions need to be discussed before moving on to the general conclusions.

Question 1 of part III was raised for essentially informational purposes. From time to time comments about the adequacy or inadequacy of the large group classroom were raised by students. This point was not systematically examined because there was no physical alternative. It was nevertheless decided to capture a more precise and general rating by all respondents. Of those responding to the questionnaire, only 3 percent found the facility inadequate for the use it was put to. Of those who made comments regardless of rating, there was no one thing that stood out by even a small minority as posing any major problem. However, in the evaluator's judgment, the seemingly constant presence of props and scenery belonging to the Drama Department made the instructor's life difficult at times.

Question 2 was asked simply to obtain a "feel" from the students as to when a large class is regarded as too large. The question was stated to obtain from the students an outer limit. The pattern of response appeared to indicate that beyond 200 is too large. Eighty-nine percent checked points at or prior to 200 with a gradual increase of percentage for each point up to and including 200. A class of 200 received 28 percent of the respondents' marks.

## CHAPTER IV

## CONCLUSION AND POSTSCRIPT

Locked in as schools generally are to particular formats of teaching by a priori assumptions of what professionals and administrators think is best for students and teachers, it is easy to overlook some of the most fundamental notions of good sense undergirded by a multitude of empirical evidence. While much of this project may be deemed as "tinkering with the system" as it now exists, it does follow that any system of schooling must stand examination of its procedures if some reform is to take place.[1] If, during the process of "listening to a different drummer" as some without the discipline of pedagogy are in these troubled days, those who at the heart of the teaching process fail to take steps to reform and renew that system, it may be difficult to make substantive changes later. Whatever small changes can be instituted as a means of improvement on the basis of reasonable evidence should not be overlooked.

Those who created this project must make clear that no claims can be made that the apparent success of the project can be replicated by others. The structure of the project and its evaluation was not along the lines of traditional empirical research design. Quite the contrary, those who authored the proposal designed it with success in mind. Simply, they wanted to see if student performance could be maintained (or increased) as measured essentially by course grades while at the same time varying the usual class format found at Lane Community College, and in the process increase the major instructor's efficiency and effectiveness. The project was structured to these ends and the students were made aware of these goals from the beginning.

---

[1] For those interested in far more extensive criticism of the general system of schooling in the United States see: Ivan Illich, Deschooling Society (New York: Harper & Row, 1971) and Everett Reimer, An Essay on Alternatives in Education (3rd ed., Cuernavaca, Mexico: Centro Intercultural De Documentacion, 1970)

The students who registered for the Large Class United States History project were in no way selected, nor once a part of the project were they required to stay. As pointed out in the chapter on evaluation of the project, a large percentage came and went from term to term. In reality, by the nature of their being college students, by and large they were already "prone to success" academically. By the nature of their presence, at Lane, they had already successfully completed twelve years of schooling or its equivalent. It was generally assumed that they had the intellect, emotional stability, and general confidence in their ability to succeed in school. One assumption that underlay the project was that academic failure at this level is due to something other than a lack of mental competence. The question one may raise is "How can such a project not succeed given its modest goals?"

At the post-secondary level of education as at lower levels of schooling, there are few variables of the standard set that have a demonstrable impact on academic achievement which can be measured by standardized tests or class grades. Often the assumption is made that such things as class size, availability of new physical facilities, expenditure per student or instructor salaries have a causal relation to academic achievement. There is nothing in the research that would indicate this.[2] It may be that a masterful teacher in terms of knowledge of his discipline and adeptness at pedagogy will have some impact on academic achievement, but there has been little demonstration of this in the research. (The difficulty of measuring whether or not a teacher is a master is large indeed and therefore no such claim can be made for the major instructor of the project.)[3] The suggestion in the proposal that an attempt be made to "measure" student morale is in a real sense misleading. At this level of schooling (as well as others), the best measure of student morale obtainable is what students individually and collectively say about the course and the instructor.

It is therefore within these limitations that the results of the project are reported. In the final analysis, very little can be claimed for the project itself except that those who were in charge learned a great deal working with students and asking them what they thought of the project. It is assumed that the students also gained something.

---

[2] See especially the Coleman Report (James S. Coleman, Equality of Educational Opportunity).

[3] W. W. Charters, Jr., "The Social Background of Teaching," in Handbook of Research on Teaching, ed. by N. L. Gage (Chicago: Rand McNally & Co., 1963), pp. 715-813.

## A Postscript To The Project

Change within the system is, by nature, methodical and all too frequently slow. Yet, in the six months since the project's completion, the major instructor has been able to devise specific course changes: 1) eliminating some of the project's more obvious weaknesses, such as anomalous grading methods, insufficient discussion leader training, and a non-inclusive group task format; and 2) instituting more defensible approaches such as performance-oriented grading and discussion leader training in group task direction. Thus, this project has resulted in rational and careful improvements all of which seem to point up the existence of a real capability for meaningful change within the system itself in spite of its present limitations.

# APPENDIX A

## Grant Proposal

# APPLICATION
# for
# GRANT FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF UNDERGRADUATE INSTRUCTION

Title of Project: PROPOSAL FOR TEACHING THE LARGE CLASS AT THE UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL

Primary Applicant:
Lane Community College
4000 East 30th Avenue East
Eugene, Oregon 97405
Tel. 747-4501

Lewis Case
Dr. Lewis Case, Dean of Instruction

Project Director:
Peter K. Simpson
Box 599, Route 8
Pleasant Hill, Oregon 97401
Tel. 746-4089

Peter K. Simpson

Principal Investigator:
Gregory P. Maltby
2671 Quince Avenue
Eugene, Oregon
Tel. 689-0630

Gregory P. Maltby

Estimated Project Commencement Date: July, 1970

Estimated Project Completion Date: July, 1971

Total Funds Requested: $10,804

# ABSTRACT

| | |
|---|---|
| Title: | Proposal for Teaching the Large Class at the Undergraduate Level |
| Project Director: | Dr. Peter K. Simpson<br>Box 599, Route 8<br>Pleasant Hill, Oregon 97401 |
| Principal Investigator: | Dr. Gregory P. Maltby<br>2671 Quince Avenue<br>Eugene, Oregon |
| Total Estimated Cost: | $10,804.00 |
| Duration: | July, 1970 through July, 1971 |
| Primary Applicant: | Lane Community College<br>4000 East 30th Avenue East<br>Eugene, Oregon 97405 |

## Statement of the Problem:

There are conflicting demands on teaching large numbers of students at a minimum of expense, yet teaching them well. Large classes create an impersonal teaching situation with little teacher-student contact, or student participation. Students feel the courses are irrelevant and this produces a real crises in student morale. Teacher efficiency, student contact time and subject matter research are all sacrificed by these traditional large class teaching situations.

## Objectives:

To organize a course which will incorporate advantages of efficiency and economy with advantages of personal involvement, and higher teacher-student contact, by:

A. Alter the formal lecture-oriented structure of the large class which will foster student participation
B. Establish a well directed profitable discussion group utilizing the creative abilities of students
C. Offer a variety of educational experiences within the three-hour course
D. Increase teacher efficiency and effectiveness.

## Evaluation:

Assess the impact of the proposed teaching methods on student performance and morale, as well as the efficiency and effectiveness of the teacher. Test techniques used in terms of student performance, measured by grades, attendance records, student capacity and participation results, and note the teacher's analysis of the degree of success achieved in the term's experiment.

# PROPOSAL FOR TEACHING THE LARGE CLASS AT THE UNDERGRADUATE LEVEL

## Statement of the Problem

There are two conflicting demands placed on undergraduate institutions today. One is the demand to teach large numbers of students at the minimum of expense; the other is to teach them well. These demands are not new. They inhere in the Jeffersonian dictums of the 18th century.[1] They have been dealt with, though never reconciled, by each generation since.[2] Today the old dilemma is clothed in new words. The taxpayers, for their part, may ask that the process of attempted reconciliation go on, but the degree of financial support they are willing to extend suggests their priorities are efficiency, stability, and economy. The large number of students, becoming larger all the time, ask on their part for relevance and personal involvement which they feel the demands of efficiency and economy have suborned.

The issue is joined on the concrete level of the large class. In the universities and larger colleges of this state the large class (one professor and anywhere from 50 - and we tend to forget that 50 is a large class - to 500 or 1,000 students) has answered the need for efficiency and economy. But in the student's mind it has created the problems of impersonal instruction, student anonymity, and, either in addition to or as a consequence of the other two, irrelevance. These, in turn, have helped produce a very real crisis in student morale.

---

[1] These demands coalesce in the title of Jefferson's "Bill for the More General Diffusion of True Knowledge" introduced in the Virginia Assembly of 1779. 262 AKGC

[2] Charles Eliot of Harvard was no more concerned about these conflicting demands in 1885 and no more energetic in accepting their challenge than James B. Conant in 1950. President Eisenhower's Council on Higher Education issued a bulletin in 1957 which was addressed in major part to the ongoing need to confront this dilemma.

In small colleges and community colleges thwarted student needs are catered to; in some cases they form the rationale for the college's existence. This catering also must take place within the limitations imposed by economy. Teacher efficiency, therefore, is sacrificed for lower teacher-student ratios (an assumed sine qua non for better teaching) and the community college teacher must repeat his lectures at the expense of preparing for other lectures on his schedule. At the same time, in these repetitive hours, he sacrifices student contact time and subject matter research.

The student, then, must weigh the advantages of personalized education in the community colleges against the disadvantages of lowered content standards which flow from excessive teaching loads. At the university he must weigh the disadvantages of depersonalized, mechanical courses requiring a mature self-discipline quite often beyond him against the advantages of more thorough and more precise content presentation under the direction of more experienced professors.[3]

This project proposes to implement and evaluate a method which may help readjust anew the two conflicting demands in American education. The plan is to organize a course which would strive to incorporate the advantages of efficiency and economy inherent in the large class with the advantages of personal involvement and a higher degree of teacher-student contact inherent in the small class. The focus of planning will be on the large class and the purpose will be to revitalize it for improving student morale while keeping standards high and efficiency at a maximum. The method could then be generalized to apply to any or all institutions of higher education, regardless of size or educational philosophy.

---

[3] This advantage has often been curtailed of late by the unpopularity of "survey" courses among senior members of department faculties. Often this is a result of the growing unpopularity among students of the depersonalizing aspects of the survey course, like the strict lecture method.

I bring to this proposal eight years of college teaching experience, which includes teaching in a small college (EOC), a community college (LCC), and a university (U. of O.). In addition, I have made a trial run this year of the method being proposed in a class of 375 students at the U. of O.

A general comment on evaluation is in order at this juncture. Interviews during this past year with psychologists, educationists, colleagues, and students have indicated a few principles worth recounting with respect to evaluating new teaching methods. Professor Lewis R. Goldberg's studies on the effects of teaching methods on student performance as measured by grades indicates no correlation between the two.[4] In other words, there is no measurable difference between a studen's performance in a class using one kind of method (discussion) and his performance in a class using another (lecture). Not only that, but apparently it does not even matter whether he likes the course or not (one can "hate" a course and still do well in it). Professor Goldberg admits one of the problems is in not being able to equate grades with the total learning that has taken place. One positive correlation, however, does obtain from these studies - student morale could be improved by changed (and often continually changing) teaching methods.

The difficulty is, then, that morale does not lend itself to quantified measurement in terms of performance. It is a subjective evaluation obtainable only through questionnaires eliciting information unrelated to performance. Yet, tacitly or explicitly, the chief educational problem at the lower level - recognized as such by community colleges and universities alike - is one of student morale.[5] Without it the best prepared and delivered lectures float out the window; the most systematic and precisely organized courses go for naught. With it, the student comes alive and often, irrespective of performance, asserts the total worth of his experience. Techniques for encouraging student involvement, self-evaluation, and small group exchange will be tested and evaluated by questionnaire.[6] Despite difficulties already mentioned, attempts will be made to correlate a pre-planned combination of these techniques and the other more time-honored techniques of lecture and discussion with student performance as well as morale. An evaluation will be made each term and successful alternatives will be incorporated in the combination of techniques to be used the next term.

---

[4] Interview, November 10, 1969.

Instructor efficiency lends itself to more objective description in terms of time spent, contact-hours gained, new techniques created, subject-matter research done, academic counseling made available, and will be reported on at the end of each term. Instructor effectiveness, again a subjective quantum, will be evaluated by questionnaires. Following is a list of objectives combined in each case with the procedures by which each objective might be achieved.

## Statement of Objectives and Procedures

Objective A: To alter the formal, lecture-oriented structure of the large class in a way that will foster student participation, enhance the value of the lecture method, and offer a variety of educational experiences within the weekly schedule.

---

[5] Prof. Albert Geurard, "The Faculty Speaks Out", Stanford Alumni Assn. Almanac pp. 8,9.

[6] An example of a student-prepared questionnaire is enclosed.

Procedures for Objective A: Hypothetical classroom situation, Social Science 201. 3 credit hours, 200 students.

1. Monday: Students meet collectively for a lecture by the professor.
    a. This weekly lecture serves the following purposes:
        (1) Introduces the topic for the week.
        (2) Stresses appropriate themes.
        (3) Provides a series of questions or topics for discussion.
    b. Students are responsible for lecture content on exams.
2. Tuesday, Wednesday, Thursday: Students meet for small discussion sessions.
    a. The class will be divided into groups of 10 or less and assigned to one of twenty student leaders who have been selected by the professor (method of selection to be discussed).
    b. These groups sign up for a meeting time on a timetable determined by the availability of space during the above three days. There will be enough choice so that students should have no difficulty fitting discussion time into their schedules.
3. Friday: the third meeting is designed to accomodate two special interest groups, one an accelerated group interested in analysis, extra reading, and the challenge of exploring the material in greater depth (subject matter majors may find these sessions helpful); and the second a study group interested in improving study skills and in obtaining a more thorough understanding of the subject matter.
    a. The accelerated sessions: the professor has the opportunity to treat the material in creative and original ways, utilizing not only the lecture but guest speakers, debates between professors, and audio-visual supports.

b. The tutorial sessions: these sessions focus on study skill, exam writing, and analysis of course content for the student with problems.

c. The students are free to attend either session or both sessions, depending on their needs and preferences.

Objective B: To establish a well-directed, profitable discussion group experience for the class while utilizing the talents of bright, interested students who rarely have a chance to exercise creative responsibility in the large class.

Procedures for Objective B:

1. Discussion groups will be led by students selected from the class on the basis of applications and interview. (See application form.)

2. Discussion leaders will meet with the professor one day each week for a two-hour seminar in teaching methods and course content (i.e., teaching methods as they relate to the transmission of subject matter).

3. A method professor from the Department of Education will have a part in the project and will help in the following ways:

   a. Planning the seminar and the course as a whole in cooperation with the subject matter professor.

   b. Serving as a resource person for fall and spring terms.

   c. Team teaching the teaching seminar with the subject matter teacher winter term. [7]

4. Discussion leaders will receive two hours of seminar credit for the course. (See supporting letter.)

5. The teaching seminar will be organized on an informal basis, but with the following formal requirements:

---

[7] See Maltby vitae; also latent objectives; also procedure C.

   a. An assigned amount of outside reading to be completed each week.

   b. A formal evaluative critique of their experience presented on the order of a term paper.

6. The professor will visit each discussion group at least once during the term, not in the person of evaluator[8], but in the person of participant and guide.

Objective C: To offer a variety of educational experiences within the scheduled framework of a three-hour course.

Procedures for Objective C: This objective is achieved by varying the methods of testing and lecturing; and by using a variety of materials and audio-visual aids during each term. Combinations selected from the following tentative list of techniques can be chosen for each term's work and evaluated both for the purpose of planning the next term's work, and for reporting on the effectiveness of their use during the term being evaluated:

1. Testing

   a. Oral exams
   b. Self-evaluated exams
   c. Peer group evaluated exams
   d. Objective-computerized exams
   e. A combination of two or more of any of these

2. Lecture Format (History)

   a. Idea-oriented
   b. Theme oriented or topic oriented
   c. Use of debate with other professors
   d. Interdisciplinary discussions

3. Material and audio-visual aids

   a. Text books
   b. Additional reading -- what books, how many, which are best suited for discussion purposes; student response
   c. Use of films, tapes etc. for special sessions.[9]

---

[8] My own experience suggests that students like to have at least one visitation per term; it supports the student-leader and shows professorial interest in the discussion experience.

[9] The precise combination of the above as they relate to testing procedures and as they best lend themselves to evaluation will be analyzed and formulated by the method professor and subject matter professor during the planning session preceding the course.

## SAMPLE APPLICATION FORM

## (for Discussion Leader)

NAME: ______________________________________

AGE: __________

CLASS: _______________

GPA: _____________

MAJOR: ________________

GPA IN MAJOR: _____________

Former Discussion and leadership experience;

List any other experiences that you feel may qualify you for this position:

Objective D: To increase teacher efficiency and effectiveness at the community college level.

Procedures for Objective D: This objective can be achieved by eliminating repetitive class sessions and the inefficient expenditures of time and energy attendant on them. The descriptive formula below explains the procedure:

1. Hypothetical formulation: One teacher with a 15 class contact hour load and two course preparations.
   One course - 12 hours          One course - 3 hours

   15 Class Contact Hours: involves two to three lectures per week or two to three class sessions of varying kinds each requiring a minimal preparation time of two to four hours.

   2 Separate courses: involves two sets of preparations on the above model.

   Total Time (excluding student contact, grading, test preparation, or office hours, and taking 3 hours as an average preparation time for class sessions and one-half hour for repreparation of each repetitive session) = 37½ hours/week.

   Repetitive Time: (i.e. time taken to repeat lectures or class session, in addition to the quarter or half-hour needed to reprepare these repeat sessions) = 13½ hours (of which 9 class-contact hours are repetitive.)

2. Hypothetical formulation under the present proposal.

   a. The 12 hour course is reduced to 3 class contact hours in the large class structure.

   b. Lecture preparations are reduced from three to one in number.

   c. All repetitive class contact hours and repreparation hours are eliminated and channelled into the following activities:

      1. Teaching seminar - 2 hours
      2. Visiting at least two discussion classes per week - 2 hours
      3. Increased student contact hours - 5 hours
      4. Preparation of lecture - 4½ hours

d. Two lecture preparations are eliminated and the time saved (6 hours) is channelled into seminar preparation and/or increased student contact hours.

e. Student contact hours, a phrase which means for the student how accessible his professor is for personal consultation, are increased from the minimum 15 to 20-22 hours weekly.

f. Summary: Student contact hours are increased. Repetitive hours are eliminated. Preparation time is increased. The professor's time, as well as the student's is relieved of is "sameness" and infused with a stimulating variety of duties and tasks. It is in this last point that teacher effectiveness can be achieved.[10]

## Latent Objectives:

A. To provide an experimental, interdisciplinary format for teacher-training in subject matter areas.

1. The use of both a subject matter and a "method" professor in the planning and teaching of the discussion leader training seminar should achieve this latent objective.

B. To foster inter-institutional cooperation in the vicinity of state universities or regional colleges with community colleges and other two year institutions.

1. Many of the discussion leaders will be education majors.[11] This experiment can lead to the use of transferable education credits for participants in the seminar rather than subject matter credits, depending on the success of the experiment as a content-teaching training device.

2. A course could be developed around the content-teaching concept for graduate students in education and in subject matter fields who are interested in college teaching. Courses like these could serve admirably as a field work project for these students, utilizing their help, in turn, for administrative and evaluative purposes.

---

[10] The Hawthorne principle - You teach better about things that enthuse you and in an environment that offers a variety of stimulating experiences.

[11] During the "trial run" this year, over one-half were education majors.

3. A far-reaching, though perhaps questionable objective may follow from F.T.E. adjustments made so that subject matter professors at the larger institutions could be utilized to team-teach large "survey" courses with community college teachers. The merging of all survey courses in that vicinity could eventually result if such an objective proved desirable.

C. Publication of an article or series of articles for wider dissemination of the results of this experiment, and participation in college teaching workshops.

## EVALUATION

This proposal is requested for the period of one year, July, 1970 - July, 1971. During that period of time we will evaluate the impact of the proposed method for teaching large classes on student performance, student morale, teacher efficiency, and teacher effectiveness.

The student-led discussion groups give the student participants a larger share of the responsibility for their own education. I think it is important to discover whether the student will respond positively to the opportunity; whether he is capable of it; and if he does not seem to be, what kind and how much direction is needed to best motivate and stimulate him.

The following kinds of evaluations are proposed on an academic term by term basis:

1. Questionnaires designed to elicit information on teacher effectiveness and student morale as it relates to (a) the course format, and (b) teaching techniques used.
2. Analysis of testing techniques in terms of student performance measured by grades (Grade curve, etc.)

3. Analysis of attendance records. (Attendance will be noted though not required every term) for correlation with performance and possible morale.
4. Analysis of student leader and teaching assistant evaluations for information on student capacity and participation.
5. Correlative and comparative analysis of the above and a final report submitted at the end of the term together with teacher analysis of the degree of success achieved in that term's experiment.

During each succeeding term the information will be gathered by the same methods used during the preceding term in order to facilitate an accurate year-end evaluation which can show the relative degree of objective-achievement within the format of each term's work and in the context of the year as a whole. It is hoped that a set of manageable criteria for use in future courses will evolve out of this kind of evaluation. It is also hoped that these criteria will leave wide latitude for the approach, personalities, and temperaments of individual teachers, while at the same time providing substantive guidelines for implementation of such a course.

A final report will be submitted no later than July 31, 1971.

## PERSONNEL AND FACILITIES

The Project Director's employment during the term of the grant will be with Lane Community College. The teaching load will be the standard fifteen hours, twelve hours of U.S. History sections, and three hours of Black History. LCC has given permission, contingent on this grant, to combine the twelve hours of U.S. History into one class (150-200 students), and made 200 level credit available for discussion leaders. They have also shown their support for such a plan without the assistance of grant money. However, it is impossible to explore, improve, expand and most importantly, to evaluate the impact and result of this radical change in course method with any measure of competency, completeness, or consistency without qualified help.

This proposal requires the services of a professor of Education with special skills in research and Social Science; two teaching assistants with B.A.'s, one in Education, and one in Social Science (in this case, History).

The teaching assistants would come from the University of Oregon, since LCC has no graduate program. Each teaching assistant would have the following responsibilities:

1. Attend planning sessions of the professors.
2. Assist administratively (space use planning, study guides, grade compilation etc.)
3. Analysis of attendance data; grade curves, tests etc.
4. Reading and programming student analysis.
5. Compile and evaluate this data with the professors.
6. Observe each discussion group at least once each term.

This assistance will give the professors the time needed to plan the sessions in detail, for research, and for consulting with authorities in such areas as testing etc.

The professors will plan the bulk of the year's work during the summer session, 1970. The results of these planning sessions will be presented to the committee before the beginning of the fall quarter.

## PERSONNEL

Peter K. Simpson, Project Director

Degrees: B. A., University of Wyoming, 1953, History Major
M. A., University of Wyoming, 1962, Major in History, Minor in Political Science
Ph.D. University of Oregon, History, 1970

Positions:

| | |
|---|---|
| Assistant Professor, Eastern Oregon College | 1962-65 |
| Teaching Assistant, University of Oregon | 1966-68 |
| Assistant Professor, Lane Community College | 1968-69 |
| Instructor, University of Oregon | 1967-70 |

(Recommendations and other information are available at the University of Oregon Placement Office)

Gregory P. Maltby, Assistant Director

Degrees: B. S., Illinois State, 1955 (Major in History)
M. S., Illinois State, 1956 (Major-History; Minor-Education)
Ed. D. University of Illinois, 1966

Positions:

| | |
|---|---|
| History Instructor, High Schools in Illinois | 1957-1962 |
| Assistant Professor, Department of Education University of Oregon | 1967-1970 |

(.42 FTE - Bureau of Educational Research, Education Dept.)

## BUDGET

This proposal for improving undergraduate teaching does not require any change or addition to the plant, the staff, or the libraries of the institutions involved. The grant aid will be used for personnel, with the exception of $500 for materials which would include money for prospective computer use.

### Personnel

| | |
|---|---|
| Peter K. Simpson, Assistant Professor Social Science, paid by Lane Community College | -- |
| Gregory P. Maltby, Assistant Professor Education, University of Oregon (pro rated) | $ 2,000 * |
| Teaching Assistant in Education (one year) | 2,700 |
| Teaching Assistant in History (one year) | 2,700 |
| Work Study Secretary (200 hours @ $1.50/hr.) | 300 |
| Summer Planning Session for Simpson and Maltby | 2,500 |
| Other payroll expenses (Employee Benefits @ .102) | 104 |
| Materials (computer use etc.) | 500 |
| Total | $10,804 |

---

* Dr. Maltby's services are for the term of the grant, although team teaching might be used in the future through interinstitutional cooperation (FTE adjustment) in the manner already used in the LCC geography program.

## APPENDIX B

## Course Content Questionnaire

# APPENDIX B

U.S. History 203

Spring, 1971 Simpson

## Course Content Questionnaire -- Instructional Objectives

### Part I

This is not a test. Look upon it more as an exercise, or even a game. Using the following definitions, match the "periods" and the "themes" on the attached form in accordance with the instructions below.

Period: a historical period is a span of past time used to set off a group of human events, activities, circumstances, attitudes, and habits of mind which have more in common with each other than they do with the events, activities, etc. of a preceding or following span of time. For example: the Revolutionary War period as contrasted with the Colonial period before it, or the New Nationalistic period after it.

Theme: a historical theme is an arbitrarily selected kind of human activity, circumstance, attitude, or habit of mind which occurs and recurs in some, many or sometimes all periods of American history. For example: an overarching dominant theme in American history is that of the American sense of mission. There are several less abstract themes within it, such as imperialism, racism, etc., some of which we would like to have you identify in this game.

Both periods and themes are what the sciences call classification schemes. The "period" is a chronological or time-oriented scheme. The "theme" is more analogous to the biological scheme of grouping similar kinds of things (i.e., genus or species). Each period is unique, but common kinds of things (themes) occur in them all.

Instructions: Place the letter of an appropriate theme or two or three (if more than one applies), but not more than three, in the blank spaces below each of the periods listed. In the blank column labeled "Reasons," state briefly the reasons which led you to select the theme or themes you chose. (Those who have not had all three terms, or only one term of this course, may wish to try their hand as well. Be our guest.)

### Part II

The following three statements GENERALLY describe WHAT YOUR INSTRUCTOR DID in teaching this course. Place a 1, 2, or 3 in the blank provided next to each description to indicate whether it was first, second, or third in respect to the time and emphasis given to it.

1. ___ (a) The instructor demonstrated how to make critical evaluations or judgments about the material in the course. His assignments, tests, and research activities principally showed us how to develop our ability to make these evaluations and judgments.

2. ____ (b) The instructor told us about the material in the course, or explained it in terms of concepts or ideas, or directed us to specific sources where these could be found. His assignments, tests, or research activities were designed to aid us in recalling informational and conceptual material.

3. ____ (c) The instructor demonstrated how to relate various concepts and pieces of information within the material of the course, as well as how to relate the material of the course to other sources or areas of experience outside it. He developed assignments, tests, and research activities which showed us how to develop relations ourselves rather than to recall or identify those already made for us.

Part III

Circle the letter in each of the following sets which better describes the GENERAL OUTCOME of this course, or the effect it had on what you did. If neither outcome applies to this course, circle letter c.

4. a b c
   (a) The course principally reproduced information, skills, or concepts which I already knew or had, at least in substance.
   (b) The course provided me with new information, skills or concepts.

5. a b c
   (a) The course provided me with specific information, concepts or skills in the field of study with which the course dealt.
   (b) The course provided for me generalized knowledge, concepts or skills which have increased my ability to understand the field of study with which the course dealt.

6. a b c
   (a) The course helped me to better see the relationship between problems, issues and events in the past and problems, issues and events today.
   (b) The course helped me to better see the relationship between the events, the circumstances, the activities, and the habits of mind within certain periods of past history.

7. a b c
   (a) The course gave me new insights into my own attitudes and my personal system of values, and, thereby, helped me better to know and understand myself.
   (b) The course gave me new ways of looking at my peers and elders in terms of their attitudes and value systems, and, thereby, helped me better to know and understand people living in the world around me today.

8. a b c
   (a) After taking this course, I have a better understanding of how historians think about the past and how they interpret it for our use today.
   (b) After taking this course, I have a better understanding of what historians do in their capacity as professional researchers, and how they reconstruct facts from the past in order to make them intelligible for us today.

Periods

1. Colonial Period (1603-1763)
2. Revolutionary Period (1763-1789)
3. Early National Period (1789-1820)
4. Period of Rising Sectionalism (1820-1845)
5. Period of Manifest Destiny and Increasing Sectional Strains (1845-1860)
6. Civil War and Reconstruction Period (1860-1876)
7. Period of Rising Industrialism; Internal Development, Continental Expansion (1876-1898)
8. Spanish American War Period (1898-1902)
9. Period of Progressive Reform (1902-1916)
10. World War I (1916-1919)
11. Prosperity Decade (1920-1930)
12. Depression and New Deal (1930-1940)
13. World War II (1941-1945)
14. Consensus at Home; Cold War Abroad (1946-1960)
15. Contemporary (1960-1971)

Themes (listed from least to most complex)

a. militarism

b. racism

c. imperialism

d. revolution (changing the system by overthrowing it)

e. reform (improvement of the social or political structure from within the system)

f. nationalism (emphasis on things that bind us together)

g. divisiveness (emphasis on things that divide us)

h. commitment to an active role of world leadership

i. a concentration on domestic affairs at the expense of overseas interest

j. periods of an imbalance either way between the demands of liberty, with its tendencies toward atomization of society (the frontier ethos), and the need for order, with its tendencies toward collectivism and planning

Reasons for Your Selection

## APPENDIX C

## Evaluation Questionnaires (four)

Code ________

PART I

NAME (Please Print) ________________________________________
Last First Middle Initial

STUDENT NUMBER ______________________________

U. S. History, Large Class Project (Lane Community College)
Evaluation #1

Code ________

## PART II

Please answer all questions by checking the appropriate blank or writing in the answer.

1. Male ______
   Female ______

2. Freshman ______
   Sophomore ______
   Other ______ ____________________________________________
   (Please specify how you define yourself if not as a freshman or sophomore.)

3. Age:
   20 or less ______
   21 - 25 ______
   26 - 30 ______
   31 - 35 ______
   36 - 40 ______
   41 or over ______

4. Full-time student (10 or more quarter hours this term) ______
   Part-time student (less than 10 quarter hours this term) ______

5. From which high school did you graduate? (Include name of town and state) ____________________________________________

   ____________________________________________

6. Are you in: the Vocational-Technical program? ______________________
   the College Transfer program? ______________________

7. What is your major at LCC? (If none, please write "none" in the blank.)

   ______________________________

8. Are you seeking a degree or certificate from LCC?

   Yes ______
   No ______
   If yes, which one? ______________________________
   If no, for what purpose are you enrolled at LCC? ____________
   ____________________________________________________

Code ________

## PART III

The following questions are designed to give us some idea about how you got into this class, what you think about it thus far and whether or not you think you will stay in the class beyond fall term. You are not being asked to "rate" the instructor. Therefore, attempt to separate your impressions of him from your answers in dealing with the questions that follow (as unrealistic as this may sound). For example, one of the things we want to know is what you think about large class sections such as the one you are now enrolled in. We are assuming you have some general impressions about big classes versus small classes--reactions that have little to do with who the instructor may be or even with the content of the course. However, if in response to any of the questions that follow, the kind of person the instructor is appears to be all important, say so and if possible suggest the reason. There is no hidden intent in these questions. One of the major things we want to know is whether or not large classes (100-200 students) have a place at LCC and if so, what needs to be done to make them workable and acceptable to students. Therefore, your judgment will be of particular importance. We shall be asking for it from time to time throughout the year.

Another point needs to be made. To some of the following questions the response may be simple and obvious to you but do not assume it is to us. For example, there is the question, "Why are you taking U. S. history?" The answer may well be that your course of study requires it or at least a sequence of some kind in social science. If that is the only reason, say so; but if there are other reasons, please give them. We will assume that when you give more than one reason in any question, that the order in which they appear indicates importance--the first being the most important and so on.

1. Why are you taking a course in U. S. history?

2. Why did you sign up for this section of U. S. history? (Some of you may have known the instructor previously. If this was a factor in your selecting this section, please indicate. If you registered one week or more late for this class, please mention this point, as well as why you picked this particular section.)

Code ________

3. Did you receive any advice about this particular section of U. S. history from your counselor? If yes, what was the nature of the advice?

4. Did you have a clear understanding that there would be small discussion sections before you signed up for this section?

5. Were the number of different times for discussion sessions sufficient to pick from so as to not upset your total schedule (including work, study, coffee breaks, as well as other classes)? What other times would you suggest?

6. If you have had prior experience with large classes, please indicate whether the experience was positive or negative and why. If no prior experience, please write no in the space that follows.

7. Thus far, what is your impression of this large class? Please elaborate as much as possible.

Code ________

8. It is generally assumed that small classes are necessary in vocational-technical courses where gaining skill in handling tools and equipment is a major goal. What about other kinds of courses (i.e., college transfer)? Does the size of the class--all other things being equal--make any difference? If so, why?

9. If you have discussed the question of class size with other students at LCC, what do they think about this matter? In other words, is the question of class size a major concern among students at LCC as far as you can tell?

10. At this point, do you think you will sign up for this class winter term? If no, why?

11. Please reflect for a few minutes and then, if you can, write down any questions you think we should be asking students about this project (U. S. History, Large Class Project) in the weeks to come.

Code ________

NAME (Please Print) ________________________________________
Last First Middle Initial

STUDENT NUMBER ____________________________

U. S. History, Large Class Project (Lane Community College)
Evaluation #2

Code ________

After a careful review of the responses to the first questionnaire and discussion with some students and Mr. Simpson, the following questions have emerged as being important to raise in terms of the evaluation of the Large Class Project.

1. At this point in the fall term, what is your general impression of the large class held on Monday and Friday?

2. Do you have any suggestions for changing and/or improving the large class?

3. Thus far, what is your impression of the small discussion group you are attending? If you are not attending a small discussion group regularly, please indicate this and tell why you are not attending?

4. Do you have any suggestions for changing and/or improving the small discussion group?

Code ________

5. Please give some indication of how you would evaluate the lectures in the large class thus far.

6. How would you evaluate the examinations you have taken this term in this class? Would you judge them to be fair? Are you tested on material you expected to be?

7. What suggestions can you make to improve examinations in this class?

8. Whether or not you are having difficulty in this class, have you for any reason sought out Mr. Simpson during office hours or at some other time? If so, for what reason(s)? Have you had difficulty in seeing him during office hours?

9. What do you think of the idea of taking attendance in the small discussion groups? In the large lecture class? Please explain your view.

Code ________

10. Will you sign up for winter term? If no, please indicate why.

11. Would you recommend this class to another student? If no, please suggest why.

Code ______

## PART I

NAME (Please Print) ________________________________
Last First Middle Initial

STUDENT NUMBER ______________________________

U. S. History, Large Class Project (Lane Community College)
Evaluation #3--Winter Quarter

Code ______

## PART IIA

PLEASE NOTE

Please fill out this page if you were not registered in this class fall term or if you were registered but did not complete the first evaluation form given out during the middle of the fall term.

- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -

Please answer all questions by checking the appropriate blank or writing in the answer.

1. Male ____
   Female ____

2. Freshman ____
   Sophomore ____
   Other ____ ______________________________
   (Please specify how you define yourself if not as a freshman or sophomore.)

3. Age:
   20 or less ____
   21 - 25 ____
   26 - 30 ____
   31 - 35 ____
   36 - 40 ____
   41 or over ____

4. Full-time student (10 or more quarter hours this term) ____
   Part-time student (less than 10 quarter hours this term) ____

5. From which high school did you graduate? (Include name of town and state) ______________________________

   ______________________________

6. Are you in: the Vocational-Technical program? __________
   the College Transfer program? __________

7. What is your major at LCC? (If none, please write "none" in the blank.)

   ______________________________

8. Are you seeking a degree or certificate from LCC?

   Yes ____
   No ____
   If yes, which one? ______________________________
   If no, for what purpose are you enrolled at LCC? ______
   ______________________________

Code ______

PART IIB

1. If you were not in the fall quarter section of this U. S. History class, please indicate why you registered for this section winter term. You may have several reasons. If so, list them in order of importance.

2. Name the discussion leader for your group.

______________________________________________

3. What is the day, time of day, and place of meeting for your discussion group?

____________________________________________________________

4. Have you been regularly attending your discussion group?

_____ Yes
_____ No

5. How many sessions have you missed this term?

______ (write in number)

Code _______

PART III

In prior evaluations from the first quarter, the questions asked were fairly general and covered a wide range of topics. In this questionnaire we wish to examine the small discussion groups or rather your impression of the particular discussion group in which you are participating.

Also, in prior evaluations the questions required that you structure your own response. In this questionnaire you will for the most part be asked to respond to a set of fixed choices.

On the following items please reflect on your experience in the small discussion group during winter term (unless otherwise indicated). Since the discussion groups started late during fall term and the discussion leaders were relatively new at their task, it would be best to exclude from your reflections any impressions of the first few meetings.

In terms of your discussion group, respond by checking what, in your judgment, is the most appropriate answer to each of the following questions:

Has the discussion group been of aid in helping you:

1. Understand the material covered in the Monday lecture

    _____ 5 indispensable
    _____ 4 great aid
    _____ 3 moderate aid
    _____ 2 little aid
    _____ 1 no aid

2. Understand the material assigned for reading during the week

    _____ 5 indispensable
    _____ 4 great aid
    _____ 3 moderate aid
    _____ 2 little aid
    _____ 1 no aid

3. Prepare for the mid-term examination

    _____ 5 indispensable
    _____ 4 great aid
    _____ 3 moderate aid
    _____ 2 little aid
    _____ 1 no aid

Code _______

Rate the following persons in terms of preparation (reading the assigned material in advance of class) for the discussion group:

4. Yourself

_____ 5 always prepared
_____ 4 often prepared
_____ 3 prepared half the time
_____ 2 seldom prepared
_____ 1 never prepared

5. The majority of the other members of the class

_____ 5 always prepared
_____ 4 often prepared
_____ 3 prepared half the time
_____ 2 seldom prepared
_____ 1 never prepared

6. The discussion leader (disregard this item if you are a discussion leader)

_____ 5 always prepared
_____ 4 often prepared
_____ 3 prepared half the time
_____ 2 seldom prepared
_____ 1 never prepared

Code ________

7. Please rank the following options in terms of your preference. Your first choice should be marked 1; second choice, 2; third choice, 3; and fourth choice, 4. NOTE that the instructor of the course in these various options is to be Mr. Simpson.

Mr. Simpson
as
Instructor

__________ Continue with mid-week small discussion groups with student leaders and a group size average of 10. The large group would continue to meet on Mondays and Fridays.

__________ Have the mid-week class meeting in the large lecture room with the instructor and with emphasis on questions and answers. However, the class would be the size it is on Mondays and Fridays.

__________ Continue the large lecture on Mondays and Fridays with the instructor, and have the mid-week discussion groups also led by the instructor. The size of the discussion groups would be 25 to 30 students.

__________ Return to the usual format for such classes at Lane--that is, meet two or three times a week in class groups of ±25.

8. Please rank the same options again according to the directions given in #7. NOTE, however, that this time no instructor's name is mentioned. What is your preference if you had no choice of instructor?

Regardless
of who the
instructor
may be

__________ Continue with mid-week small discussion groups with student leaders and a group size average of 10. The large group would continue to meet on Mondays and Fridays.

__________ Have the mid-week class meeting in the large lecture room with the instructor and with emphasis on questions and answers. However, the class would be the size it is on Mondays and Fridays.

__________ Continue the large lecture on Mondays and Fridays with the instructor, and have the mid-week discussion groups also led by the instructor. The size of the discussion groups would be 25 to 30 students.

__________ Return to the usual format for such classes at Lane--that is, meet two or three times a week in class groups of ±25.

Code _______

9. With reference to Questions 7 and 8, if you have an option that you would rate high but was not mentioned, please indicate what it is in the following space.

Please reflect for a few moments. Do you have any comments to make about the following?

10. The large lecture classes on Mondays and Fridays

11. The small discussion group

Code _____

## PART I

NAME (Please Print) ________________________________
Last First Middle Initial

STUDENT NUMBER ____________________

U. S. History, Large Class Project (Lane Community College)
Evaluation #4--Spring Quarter

Code _____

## PART II-A

PLEASE NOTE

Please fill out this page only if you were not registered in this class fall or winter term or if you were registered but did not complete either the first or third evaluation form given out during the middle of the fall and winter terms, respectively.

---

Please answer all questions by checking the appropriate blank or writing in the answer.

1. Male _____
   Female _____
2. Freshman _____
   Sophomore _____
   Other _____ ______________________________
   (Please specify how you define yourself if not as a freshman or sophomore.)
3. Age: 20 or less _____
   21 - 25 _____
   26 - 30 _____
   31 - 35 _____
   36 - 40 _____
   41 or over _____
4. Full-time student (10 or more quarter hours this term) _____
   Part-time student (less than 10 quarter hours this term) _____
5. From which high school did you graduate? (Include name of town and state)
   ______________________________
   Approximately how many students were in your high school? _____
6. Are you in: the Vocational-Technical program? _____
   the College Transfer program? _____
7. What is your major at LCC? (If none, please write "none" in the blank.)
   ______________________________
8. Are you seeking a degree or certificate from LCC?
   Yes _____
   No _____
   If yes, which one? ______________________________
   If no, for what purpose are you enrolled at LCC? _____
   ______________________________
9. If you were not in the winter term of this U. S. History class, please indicate why you registered for this section spring term. You may have several reasons. If so, list them in order of importance.

Code _____

PART II-B

1. Name the discussion (project) leader for your group:

______________________________________________________

2. When and where does your discussion group meet?

Day ________________ Time __________ Place ________________________

3. Have you been attending your discussion group regularly?

_____ Yes

_____ No

How many sessions of your discussion group have you missed this term?

_____ (write in number)

4. Have you been attending the large lecture class regularly?

_____ Yes

_____ No

How many sessions of the lecture class have you missed this term?

_____ (write in number)

Code _____

## PART III

The following questions deal with a variety of issues related to Mr. Simpson's class. Many of them emerge from answers to questions in prior evaluations that some of you have completed. Please respond to each of them as honestly as possible. In no way will any of your answers be used in judging your grade in the course. Because of the use of a code number, only the project evaluator (Mr. Maltby) will know which student responded in a particular way to each question. The answers to these questions will be of great value in writing the final report of the large class project.

1. How would you rate this classroom as far as physical arrangements are concerned--seating, audibility, visibility, etc.?

   _____ superior
   _____ adequate
   _____ inadequate

   Comment if you wish:

2. Check the one point at which you feel a large class, such as the one you are now in, would become too large in terms of enrollment.

   _____ 100
   _____ 125
   _____ 150
   _____ 175
   _____ 200
   _____ 225
   _____ 250 or more

3. Do you think that on Mondays and Fridays a student can miss the large class meetings in this course more easily than his other classes at Lane?

   _____ Yes

   _____ No

   Please give reasons for your answer:

Code _____

4. Have you had any difficulty in obtaining a conference with Mr. Simpson to discuss your academic problems (if any)?

_____ Yes

_____ No

_____ I have had no reason to see Mr. Simpson

If yes, please indicate what the difficulty was in obtaining a conference.

5. The following is a list of resources related to increasing your knowledge and understanding of United States history this term. Please rank them in order of importance by writing a 1 in the blank of the most important, a 2 for the second most important and on through 7, the least important.

_____ textbook (HMA)

_____ reserve and/or suggested readings

_____ lectures

_____ textbook (Hofstadter, American Political Tradition)

_____ small discussion (project) group

_____ examination

_____ weekly study guides and other such handouts

If there is some other resource not listed above, please indicate what it is and suggest how the resource would be rated in terms of increasing your knowledge and understanding of United States history.

Please put a check on the scale indicating the importance of this resource.

_____/_____/_____/_____/_____/_____/_____/_____

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

most important least important

Code _____

Please answer this next question _only_ if you took Mr. Simpson's midterm examination spring quarter or one or more of his examinations winter quarter.

6. The following is a list of resources that should have been useful in preparing you to take the _last_ examination in Mr. Simpson's class. Please rank them in order of importance by writing a _1_ in the blank of the most important, a _2_ for the second most important, and on through _6_, the least important.

_____ textbook (HMA)

_____ reserve and other suggested readings

_____ lectures

_____ textbook (Hofstadter, _American Political Tradition_)

_____ small discussion group review sessions

_____ weekly study guides and other such handouts

If there is some other resource not listed above, please indicate what it is and suggest how you would rate the resource as to usefulness in preparing you to take the _last_ examination.

Please put a check on the scale indicating the importance of this resource.

_____/_____/_____/_____/_____/_____/_____

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

most important least important

Code _____

7. Please rank the following options in terms of your preference. Your first choice should be marked 1; second choice, 2; third choice, 3; and fourth choice, 4. (NOTE that the instructor of the course in these various options is to be Mr. Simpson.)

Mr. Simpson
as
Instructor

__________ Continue the class as it is presently arranged--that is, the large group meeting with the instructor on Monday and Friday, and the small discussion or project group led by student leaders on Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday. Average size of small group would be 10.

__________ Meet three times a week (Monday, Wednesday, and Friday) in the large group with the instructor. The Wednesday class would essentially be devoted to questions from the students.

__________ Continue the large group meetings on Monday and Friday with the instructor and have the mid-week (Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday) small discussion or project groups also led by the instructor. The size of the discussion groups would be 25 to 30 students.

__________ Return to the usual format for social science classes at Lane--that is, meet three times per week (50 minutes each time) or two times per week (75 minutes each time) with the instructor. The class size would be ± 25.

Please indicate the reason(s) for the selection of your first choice.

Please indicate the reason(s) for the selection of your fourth choice.

Code _____

8. Please rank the same options again according to the directions given in #7. (NOTE, however, that this time no instructor's name is mentioned.)

Regardless
of who the
instructor
may be

__________ Continue the class as it is presently arranged--that is, the large group meeting with the instructor on Monday and Friday, and the small discussion or project group led by student leaders meeting on Tuesday, Wednesday, or Thursday. Average size of small group would be 10.

__________ Meet three times a week (Monday, Wednesday, and Friday) in the large group with the instructor. The Wednesday class would essentially be devoted to questions from the students.

__________ Continue the large group meetings on Monday and Friday with the instructor and have mid-week (Tuesday, Wednesday or Thursday) small discussion or project group also led by the instructor. The size of the discussion groups would be 25 to 30 students.

__________ Return to the usual format for social science classes at Lane--that is, meet three times per week (50 minutes each time) or two times per week (75 minutes each time) with the instructor. The class size would be ± 25.

Please indicate the reason(s) for the selection of your first choice.

Please indicate the reason(s) for the selection of your fourth choice.

Code _____

9. With reference to questions 7 and 8, if you have an option that you would rate high but was not mentioned, please indicate what it is in the following space.

10. If you were in Mr. Simpson's class during winter term, how would you compare the small discussion group and its activities winter term to the small discussion (project) group and its activities during spring term? Elaborate on your answer.

11. Do you have any comments with regard to improvement of the following areas of this course? If not, do you have a comment of any other kind?

a) The large lecture classes on Monday and Friday

b) The small discussion (project) group